THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Dean of Winchester, The Deanery, Winchester, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXVI FEBRUARY, 1933 No. 152

EDITORIAL

Recent correspondence in *The Times* has drawn attention to the proposals for Church union in South India, and the misgivings which these have elicited among Church-people in this country were admirably expressed in letters by Fr. Talbot, Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, and by Bishop Talbot. Canon Streeter writes cheerfully of the possible secession of Anglo-Catholics on the issue; but he is mistaken if he supposes that that is the most immediate danger. [One would have thought that he would have regarded a schism at home as a somewhat serious price to pay for a measure of union in India; but in that, perhaps, we should be mistaken.] The real danger is that in the Church at home there may be so grave a want of confidence in what is taking place in South India that missionary funds which at present go to the Church there would be diverted elsewhere. That would hardly be a happy start for the new South Indian Church, and its reactions on missionary finance at home would be almost as regrettable.

The immediate issue, be it observed, is not the South Indian scheme in itself, but the conduct of affairs in the interim period before it is inaugurated. At the time when the scheme received the general support of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 it was felt by those who most care for Catholic principles to be an experiment which involved great irregularities and great risks: but they were irregularities and risks which appeared to be outweighed by the prospect of a real union on an episcopal basis being established within a generation. So much of novelty, however, and so wide a latitude were involved that the greatest care seemed imperative, lest the very wide limits laid down in the scheme should be transgressed in the intervening period. Section IV. (*b*) 3 of the scheme, for instance, contains the following sentences:

They recognize that the act of union will initiate a process of growing together into one life and of advance towards that complete spiritual unity. If during this process difficulties and anomalies arise, the united Church will be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience by Church authorities or by majorities; nor will it in its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the uniting Churches. . . . They therefore pledge themselves and fully trust each other that in the united Church no arrangements with regard to churches, congregations or ministers will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would offend the conscientious convictions of any persons directly concerned. . . .

This passage expresses the spirit and principles which it was intended should guide the process of coalescence *after* "the act of union": it would surely seem vital, if confidence in the future is to be created, that they should also govern the proceedings before it. And intercommunion, in the sense of permission to our own fellow-Churchmen to receive Communion at the hands of celebrants who have not themselves been ordained to the priesthood, was among the things which it was quite understood did transgress "the long-established traditions" of one of the uniting bodies and would therefore be debarred. Yet it is now proposed in South India that this barrier shall be waived forthwith in the case of conferences of the negotiating bodies. It is described as an "anticipation" or "forestalling" of the blessings of projected union. This is one of the pleas commonly advanced, in regard to private affairs, by the advocates of compassionate marriage; and it is odd to find it used for so different a purpose on the lips of Christian divines. The truth is that, if it takes place, there may easily be no blessings to forestall.

We count it a great privilege to publish this month an article from the pen of Sir William Ramsay, and it is clear that his eighty-two years have not impaired the powers of his scholarship. It appears opportunely, too, in conjunction with two other articles on New Testament subjects, both of them illustrating in different ways the progress of learning in this field. Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock's suggestive paper should be read in conjunction with Dr. Nygren's book *Agape and Eros*, to which we drew attention last November; and it is significant that Sir Edwyn Hoskyns should have chosen to illustrate Dr. Kittel's new Lexicon from a cognate theme. All alike provide fresh evidence, not only as to the vitality of the kind of New Testament scholarship of which Bishop Lightfoot was such a master, but also of the fact that the most up-to-date criticism serves, in proportion to its scientific thoroughness, only to make more plain the uniqueness of the Christian Gospel and the thought

and language in which it found expression. As *Mysterium Christi* showed, the best German and the best English scholarship are now at one on the main issues; and foundations have been laid for a fresh advance in those fields of historical theology which have been so distinctive of the Church of England.

We publish below two articles on the problem of the revision of the Liturgy. They illustrate very clearly the tension which seems to exist in the Church between theory and practice; for Dr. Lowther Clarke seems undoubtedly to have theory on his side, and Mr. Mackenzie practice. We confess that our own sympathies are with Mr. Mackenzie, on the ground that revision along 1549 lines is historically more consistent with our present rite than the more drastic change advocated in 1928; and though there is hardly any early liturgical precedent for the 1549 form of invocation of the work of the Holy Ghost, it is not in itself unscholarly or open to doctrinal objection. It may, however, be some time before liturgical reform comes again to the fore; and meanwhile we should like to enter a strong plea for the faithful and audible use of the existing order, at least from the *Sanctus* onwards. It has shown itself for nearly three centuries to be a rite on which Church-people of the most diverse standpoints can unite; and that alone is an immense asset. Further, the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice does not depend on any *verbal* oblation other than what is involved in the consecration itself—a point on which more emphasis might be laid than is commonly the case.

Another important consideration in favour of the existing order is its admirable adaptability to the needs of those who attend a daily Mass. We have two very precious traditions amongst devout spirits in the Church, which may be called respectively the "Morning Watch" and the "Daily Mass." Each is something of the other: there will be something of both in either. Both alike belong to the early hours of the day, and are concerned with a waiting upon God, a submission to His will, and a welcoming of His grace, which are of the very essence of the Christian life. They are sometimes contrasted, as though the approach to God involved in the one were primarily individual, in the other social; but, in fact, the second lends itself to manifold individual uses and intentions, while the first provides occasion for an intercessory communion as wide as mankind itself. The destination lies rather, we suggest, in a different direction—namely, in the presence or absence of a fixed rite. The Morning Watch is likely enough to have some kind of liturgical structure; but this structure is of the individual's own

choice and admits of almost limitless variation; while within the structure itself the soul is free to speak or to listen as the Spirit moves it. Freedom, that is to say, is its principal characteristic; and this freedom extends not only to the substance and form of prayer, but also to its circumstances, such as posture, place, method, and so forth.

The Daily Mass, on the other hand, is essentially *common* worship; and for that purpose a fixed form is a *sine quâ non*. In particular is this the case in that central part of the rite which has to do with the Consecration. The individual worshipper is likely enough to dispense himself from attention to the letter of this or that part of the service; but his mind is bound to be concentrated from the Preface to the Lord's Prayer, if he is not going to lose that for which (whether as communicant or otherwise) he has come to church. His devotions are centred in the memorial of the death of Christ now being made; he is aware of it as something in which he participates with the whole Church; and he has a right to be spared any eccentricities of form at such a time. What form of Canon the Church uses—whether 1662 or 1549 or 1928—is of much less importance, therefore, than that it should be always the same; and it is impossible to find any excuse for deviations from the rite at this point which rest on no other authority than the individual ideas of the celebrant.*

We have confined ourselves above to the point of view of the lay worshipper: but the considerations we have urged appear to apply equally to the priest. Not many clergy are liturgical experts, and those few are usually the least inclined to deviate from the Church's order. They probably realize that no knowledge of liturgical matters is more important than that which consists in sensitiveness to the minds of the worshippers. And (whatever may be said about ceremonial) these minds require, and are entitled to, a settled uniformity of rite. There are, happily, indications that this need on their part, and this canonical duty on the priest's part, are being more and more appreciated by the clergy. But there are still many bad habits to be surrendered; and only when that is done can we expect to be able to embark with promise of fruitful results on the task of revising the Canon.

* It is sometimes urged that the existence of two alternative rites is not found objectionable in the Episcopal Church of Scotland. Provided that both are equally authorized, the objections urged above are less cogent. But we believe that a single form is far preferable, and we have always regarded the provision of alternative Canons as one of the major faults of the 1928 Book.

ST. PAUL'S HYMN OF LOVE

(1 Cor. xiii.)

THE charm and finish of St. Paul's hymn of love prove that it was no extemporaneous effusion, but was rather the outcome of long and laborious work. Living in a centre of Greek life and literature, lecturing after school hours in the school where the children had been taught poetry earlier in the day (Strabo, 1.2.3), attracting, without doubt, some well-educated people by his remarkable *diatribes* to his classes, and visiting and discoursing with them in their homes, it would be a strange thing if St. Paul, the versatile receptive genius, who always reacted to his environment, and who deliberately became "all things to all men," would not feel the fascination of Greek lyrical poetry and song. He himself sang hymns and bade his people sing "psalms and hymns and spiritual odes" (ὠδαί) (Eph. v. 19, Col. iii. 16) where "spiritual" points a contrast with the sensual odes of Anacreon whose verse (ἡμίαμβοι) he imitates in Eph. v. 14.

The words of 1 Cor. xiii. are carefully chosen; its clauses are distinctly metrical. The Ode consists of 198 words in Tregelles (taking in xiv. 1*a*) which fall into 70 metrical verses. Such short verses are a feature of Euripides's later plays—*e.g.*, in the *Phœnissæ* the chorus beginning at 1019 has 52 lines (Paley) and 158 words, three words to a line. Plato's verses on *Eros* in *Symposium*, 197D, which he claims to be metrical (ἔμμετρον), consist of 56 words which fall into 27 verses according to the commata and rhymes. The 70 verses of 1 Cor. xiii. consist principally of dochmiac, trochaic, and iambic metres. We have versus Adonii like οὐ φυσιοῦται, Cretics like οὐ παροξύνεται, Choriambi like ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε, Glyconics like οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν, Logaœdic verses like ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, etc. Some verses not so easily classed have parallels in the Greek tragedies —*e.g.*, compare ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον (iamb. dim. cat.) and φρυγῶν δὲ πατρίδι πένθος (*Troades*, 567); εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια and ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ναυκληρίαν *Alcestis*, 112 (cretics with base). Like κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν and other verses, κἂν ἔχω προφητείαν καί is a trochaic tetrapody.[1] We have trochaic dimeters (ithyphallic) like γέγονα χαλκὸς ἠχῶν.[2] Dochmiacs abound like τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου.[3] There are trochaic tripodies like οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι,[4] iambic dimeters like οὐ περπερεύεται.[5] With

[1] *Cf.* ἱππείῳ γένει πολεύων, *Ant.*, 240. "Often used," Jebb. *Electra*, lxxii. Also πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν, v. 2.

[2] *Cf.* δόλιον ἔσχον ἄταν, *Troad.*, 530.

[3] *Cf.* ἀκόρεστος γένει, *Agam.*, 1105.

[4] *Cf.* Ἀργόθεν πορευθείς, *Androm.*, 1031.

[5] *Cf.* λέλαμπεν Ἴλιος, *Troad.*, 1295.

χρηστεύεται ἡ ἀγάπη compare πέτρᾳ προσαναινόμενον *Prometheus*, 151 (iamb. dip. and choriambus, frequent in this passage) οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς is a Pherecratic,[1] οὐ χαίρει 'πὶ τἀδικίᾳ is a third Glyconic (Cat.);[2] οὐθέν εἰμι is a trochaic monometer;[3] ἵνα καυχήσωμαι (ℵ AB) is a dochmiac;[4] οὐ ζηλοῖ ἡ ἀγάπη is logaœdic with base,[5] or a molossus and choriambus.[6] In ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν we have a combination of cretic and dochmiac monometer;[7] καὶ ἐκ μέρους προφητεύομεν is an iambic dipody with dochmiac monometer.[8] ὅταν δ'ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον is Glyconic with base. *Hercules F.*, 760-813, has many such lines.[9] κατήργηκα and ἐπεγνώσθην are Antispasts;[10] ἡ ἀγάπη is a choriambus;[11] ἄρτι γινώσκω is a trochaic monometer hyper;[12] πίστις, ἐλπὶς ἀγάπη is a trochaic tripody; νυνὶ δὲ μένει is an iambic monometer;[13] ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος and the next two verses are trochaic with anacrusis;[14] ἐλογιζόμην ὡς νήπιος is an iambic dimeter frequent in the *Troades*, 511-567; βλέπομεν γάρ ἄρτι is a dochmiac or iambic monometer hyper. (*cf. Hec.* 925, χρυσεῶν ἐνόπτρων); δι' ἐσόπτρου an Ionicus a minore;[15] ἐν αἰνίγματι is a dochmiac. We have also several iambic dipodies—*e.g.*, πάντα στέγει (*cf. Troades*, 1216) With λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων compare λόχον δ'ἐξέβαιν' Ἄρης (*Troades*, 560). Other metres found in choral odes, the molossus, bacchius, dispondeus, occur here. There are certain refrains in this Ode —*e.g.*, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω (3), trochaic with base;[16] καταργηθήσεται (3), trochaic trip. cat. with base.[17] ὥστ' ὄρη μεθιστάναι is trochaic dim. cat.[18] οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν is a third Glyconic (cat.).[19] There are some thirty choreic (trochaic) verses, eleven dochmiac, eight iambic, six logaœdic (Glyconic) out of seventy; and these are the favourite measures in the Greek choral odes.

The examples given can prove the metrical character of the hymn. This miniature ode falls naturally into four divisions. In ten of his odes Pindar has four systems of triads, based on

[1] *Cf.* σπέρχουσιν, τί γένωμαι, *Septem. C.T.*, 282.
[2] *Cf.* φθογγά του στίβου κατ' ἀνάγ, *Philoctetes*, 204 (Wunder).
[3] *Cf.* νύξ ἐφέρπει, *Alc.*, 269. [4] *Cf.* ἐν ἐνύδρῳ τεύχει, *Agam.*, 1105.
[5] *Cf.* σωτῆρε τῆς Ἑλένας, *Hel.*, 1500.
[6] See Ajax, 1189. μόχθων ἄταν ἐπάγων (Glyconic, Jebb). *Bacchæ*, 870, 890, etc.
[7] Frequent in *Ajax*, 879-914. See Jebb, *e.g.*, τόνδε συννανταν, ὦ τάλας, 902.
[8] *Cf.* παλαιγενεῖς δὲ Μοίρας φθίσας, *Eumen.*, 160.
[9] *E.g.*, 813, ἄμιλλαν, εἰ τὸ δίκαιον.
[10] *Cf. Electra* (E), 141. ἐπορθρεύσω, *Troades*, 281.
[11] *Cf.* θεσσαλὸς ἦ, *Rhesus*, 699. [12] *Cf.* εὖθ' ὁ γηραιός, *Pers.*, 850.
[13] *Cf.* ἔσται τι νέον, *Hec.*, 83.
[14] *Cf.* μάλα μοι τοῦτ ἐμμένοι, *Prometheus*, 542, 553, etc. This metre is frequent in choral odes—*e.g.*, *Troades*, 847.
[15] *Cf.* βασιλεῦσιν, *Electr.* (S), 813, etc. [16] *Cf. Troades*, 847, τὸ δὲ τῆς λευκοπτέρου.
[17] *Cf. Ion.*, 687, δειμαίνω συμφοράν.
[18] Frequent in choral odes—*e.g.*, *Œd. T.*, 201, ἀστραπᾶν κράτη νέμων.
[19] *Cf. Philoctetes*, 1187, ὅς γε σὰν λιπὼν ἱεράν.

the divisions of the Greek temple, which had three and sometimes four compartments. Of these four divisions, connected like Pindar's by points of transition, each has again three parts resembling in some way the strophe, antistrophe, and epode of the Greek chorus. The first strophe would run:

ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις (Dochmiac).
τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Dispondeus).
λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων (Troch. with iambic base; *cf. Troades*, 560).
ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω (Trochaic with anacrusis; *Troades*, 847).
γέγονα χαλκὸς ἠχῶν (Troch. dim.).
ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον (iamb. dim. cat.).

The last epode would be:

νυνὶ δὲ μένει (Iamb. monom.).
πίστις ἐλπὶς ἀγάπη (Ithyphallic, troch. trip.).
τὰ τρία ταῦτα (Adonius).
μείζων δὲ τούτων (Dochmiac or Iambic monom. hyper.).
ἡ ἀγάπη (Choriambus).
διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην (Dactylic with base and choriamb.).

The temple-like structure of this hymn with its four parts corresponding to τὸ πρόθυρον, the pillared porch, ὁ πρόναος the vestibule, ὁ ναός or shrine, ὁ ὀπισθόδομας, the Treasury or Bank, as at Ephesus and Athens, is in keeping with its opening words which conjure up a scene of worshippers advancing towards a temple like Diana's—"the raucous crowd" of dancers, musicians, votaries of the goddess, prostitutes of both sexes, Galli, priests, with clanging of cymbals and beating of tambourines, walking and dancing in procession, and making the air hideous with noise. Such a procession, in which Julian the Apostate loved to march carrying the sacred emblems as priest, was very different from that of the Christian following the road of Love, or Christ, as it means here, the Lord of Love. Such a picture is conjured up by Ignatius in his letter to the Ephesians (c. 9): "You are all companions of the Way (σύνοδοι), God-bearers, shrine-bearers (ναοφόροι) (their body was the ναός of the Spirit), Christ-bearers, bearers of holy things, adorned in all ways with the commandments of Jesus Christ." The saint rejoices to take part in their festival. He had just described their faith as their upward conductor (ἀναγωγεύς) and love as ὁδὸς ἡ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς θεόν—the way *par excellence* of Paul, that leads up to God. Ignatius also had his picture suggested to him by a similar pagan procession to a temple of Isis or Diana. Miniature shrines and boxes (the κέρνος) containing their secret mysteries and other things were carried in these processions. "At Ephesus," said Sir W. Ramsay, "we have in an inscription of this period a long enumeration of the various objects and

ornaments which were to be carried in one of the great annual processions." In this choral ode St. Paul enumerates the qualities and characteristics which Love has, and which Love imparts to the true Christian as he advances on the road to Paradise. There are numerous references in classical writers to such pagan processions. We have the χαλκὸς ἠχῶν, the κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον (v.l. ἀλαλάζων L, shouting to the cymbal) and the γλῶσσαι in Catullus (lxiii. 21 *f.*, 28 *f.*)—

Ubi *cymbalum* sonat vox, ubi *tympana* reboant,
Thiasus repente *linguis* trepidantibus *ululat.*

"Where the voice sounds to the accompaniment of the cymbal"—Ellis takes cymbalum as accusative, like "hominem sonat," (Æn. i. 328)=sonat sonum cymbali. Ovid (F. iv. 213) describing the "Deæ comites" says "they beat their *cymbala*, instead of spears and their *tambourines*, tympana, in place of shields." In *Met.* iii. 532, "Have the bronzes beaten against the bronzes and the *tibia* with the crooked horn, and magical deceptions such power?"[1] demands Pentheus. "Do the voices of effeminates and the obscene crowds and the hollow tambourines dismay you?"[2] Again in *Fasti* iv. 181 *f.* he says, "The sexless creatures will beat their hollow tambourines.[3] Bronzes beat against bronzes will give their tinklings. She (the goddess Cybele) will be borne on the necks of votaries, and received with howlings as she passes."

Ibunt semimares, et inania *tympana* tundent
Aeraque tinnitus aere repulsa dabant
Ipsa sedens molli comitum cervice feretur
Urbis per medias *exululata* vias.

Juvenal (vi. 515) describes this "rauca cohors" with their plebeian tambourines (tympana) and the Phrygian mitre of their "obscene semivir" priest; Propertius (iv. 7) the round bronzes (aera) of Cybele; Horace (Od. i. 16) the Corybantes and their bronzes (aera), and the noisy babblement of the votaries;[4] Martial the crowd with the sistrum;[5] Statius "the hides and the bronzes of the god" and "the bangings of the twin bronzes and Idæan hides";[6] and Silius (I.) "the *tinklings*

[1] "aerane tantum | Aere repulsa valent? et adunco tibia cornu | Et magicæ fraudes?"

[2] Femineæ voces et mota insania vino,
Obscœnique greges et inania tympana vincunt?

[3] *Cf.* also *Met.* iv. 29: "Impulsaque tympana palmis, Concavaque aera sonant." This shows the tympana were beaten by hand.

[4] Circumtonuit Bellona. [5] sistrataque turba (xii. 29).

[6] *Theb.* v. 730, "tergaque et aera Dei"; viii. 221, "gemina aera sonant Idæaque terga." The terga are the tympana, "tentis tympana tergis" (Ausonius, *Ep.* XXV. 21).

of the hollow bronzes and the harsh sounds of the tambourines."[1]

The *tympanum* according to Rich (*Companion*, p. 704) was a wooden hoop covered on one side with hide like a sieve and set round with small bells or jingles. Diodorus (S), iii. 58 *f.*, speaks of the κύμβαλα and τύμπανα and the player as ὀλολύζουσα καὶ τυμπανίζουσα. These are evidently the two instruments of music referred to in the Ode. Mæcenas also alludes to the resonance (ἠχῶν) of the jangling tambourine—"Ades (Dea) et *sonante typano* quate flexibile caput." It is also clear that the Vg. rendering "cymbalum tinniens," the origin of the A.V. "tinkling cymbal," was due to the influence of the *tinnitus* of the Latin poets. ἀλαλάζον may refer to the shouting accompaniment (ἀλαλά) and answers to the ὀλολύζων of Diodorus, the *ululat* of Catullus and Seneca and the *exululata* of Ovid. Lucretius[2] adds an item of interest. He depicts some as playing their *tympana* and *cymbala*, while others (not directly mentioned), begging priests,[3] collect the largesse, the people "giving their *doles* bountifully." This expression, "largificâ stipe ditantes," throws light on Paul's ψωμίζω here. Seneca[4] scoffs at these rites, the rattlings of the sistrum and the howlings of the votaries. Apuleius[5] describes the Galli and their sharp tinklings. Lucian[6] depicts them clashing their *tympana* and singing their songs. Clement[7] (A), *Prot.* ii. 15, refers to the mystical significance these instruments acquired by this use in procession. "I ate from the tympanum, I drank from the cymbal. I carried the sacred basket" (κέρνος). Firmicus (Mat.), *de Errore* cx., copied this expression, adding: "I became a votary (μύστης) of Attis." From the days of Pindar, whose fragment (Strabo x. 469) describes the whirlings of the *cymbals*[8] and the *clashings* of the castanets"[9] (κρόταλα), these Galli, their processions and instruments, figure largely in classical literature. It would be, therefore, strange if we found no reference in St. Paul to this feature of pagan life and ceremonial. In this Ode we may see other references to such processions. Apuleius[10] speaks of the *mirrors* which were carried in the processions of Isis. "Others carried shining mirrors on their backs to show to the

[1] *Punica* xvii. 18:

Circum arguta cavis *tinnitibus* aera simulque
Certabant rauco *resonantia tympana* pulsu:

[2] ii. 618-636. [3] The μητραγύρται satirized by Menander in the *Auriga*.
[4] *De Vita, B.* 13, 27: "Sistrum aliquis concutiens, aliqua . . . *ululat*."
[5] *Met.* xi. 9. He also speaks of a bronze rattle, "aereum *crepitaculum*."
[6] παταγέουσι (πάταγος, clash of arms [Hdt.]), *Syrian Goddess*, 486.
[7] ἐκ τυμπάνου ἔφαγον, ἐκ κυμβάλου ἔπιον, ἐκερνοφόρησα.
[8] ῥόμβοι κυμβάλων. [9] κεχλάδειν (χλάζω, sound, *shout*, L. and S.).
[10] *Met.* xi. 9: "Aliæ quæ nitentibus speculis pone tergum reversis venienti deæ obvium commonstrarent obsequium."

goddess those who followed as if they were approaching to worship." Compare "Now we see through a mirror, then face to face." There is a point in οὐθέν[1] εἰμι. I am *nought*, like the Gallus, a sexless nothing. So the courtesan called one of the women who had put on her husband's apparel in the *Ecclesiazusæ* (144) of Aristophanes—οὐδὲν γὰρ εἶ. Compare Plautus, *Miles* v. 16, "homo nihili factus" (castratus). There is a soupçon of the loss of manhood which was sacrificed by maddened youths at such festivals. Such a one made himself ἀτελής, as Lucian[2] says, a "notha mulier" as Catullus[3] says—a thing imperfect, a contrast to that which is perfect, τὸ τέλειον. St. Paul used this term "nothing" with emphatic contempt: "I am just such another worthless fellow as those who play those vile instruments." Had he known Menander, as one might suppose from his quotation from the *Thais* in 1 Cor. xv. 33, "Evil associations corrupt good morals,"[4] he would have agreed with his description of such instruments and processions[5]—"instruments of bravado invented by shameless wretches." Such is the pagan background of the picture St. Paul presents—a procession to the temple, musical instruments, horrid tumult, doles, mirrors, mysteries, and vile creatures who had lost their manhood and had become "nothing." Against such an unholy background stands out the grandest Personality ever limned by poet—Love. Why should St. Paul have expressed his feelings about Love personified in verse? It was the fashion. Plato wrote a description of Eros in *verse*,[6] as he says, and his own commata and rhymes prove, which like this Ode on Love should be printed as verse. Julian (Emperor) wrote semi-anapæstic verses.[7] We have shown how patient the commata of 1 Cor. xiii. are of the Greek choral metres, chiefly the choreic, which in the logaœdic or prose-verse forms were eminently suited to the writer's theme, art, and skill. The following is an attempt to express it in English.[8]

[1] The wider meaning "nihil sum," a nonentity, also is found, Ter., *Andria* II. i. 16. Cicero, *ad Fam.* VII. 33, 1, and οὐδέν in Aristoph., *Knights*, 1240, etc.

[2] *Syrian Goddess*, 467. [3] *Attis*, 26.

[4] φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρήσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί.

[5] τόλμης ὄργανα εὑρημέν' ἀνθρώποις ἀναιδέσιν, Meineke, *Com. Frag.* ii. 914.

[6] ἔμμετρον, *Symposium*, 197D.

[7] See his *Symposium*.

[8] This ode at all events is not patient of the Zielinskian analysis applied to the Pauline Corpus by Dr. H. J. Rose (*J.T.S.*, October, 1923). There are several refrains which will not fit in. See *J.T.S.*, April, 1929, "Tests for the Pastorals," by the present writer.

TO LOVE

(A TRANSLATION SHOWING THE DIVISIONS AND CONNECTING LINKS OF THE ODE)

τὸ πρόθυρον (or pillared porch).

I. (*a*) Though with the tongues of men I speak, aye of angels,
If Love be not mine, I have become sounding bronze
Or loud clanging cymbal.

(*b*) Though prophecy be mine, the secret lore of all the mysteries,
And all the knowledge that there is, and all the faith there is,
Such as might move mountains, yet if Love be not mine,
I but a cypher am.

(*c*) Though I distribute doles of all my worldly goods
And give my body too, so that the *boast* be mine,
Yet if Love be not mine, no benefit is mine.

THE CHARACTER OF LOVE

ὁ πρόναος (or vestibule).

II. (*a*) Love suffers much and long, of kindness Love is full.
No envy lurks in Love, He shows no *boastfulness*,
Displays no arrogance, and no unseemliness.

(*b*) He seeketh not what is not His (B), nor is provoked,
Of evil keeps no count, injustice gives no joy to Him.
His joy is with the Truth.

(*c*) He *shelters* all mankind; the best He doth believe.
He hopeth all things good: all things He doth endure,
Love faileth nevermore.

ὁ ναός (the shrine or inner sanctuary of the Temple where the image stood. Here there is no image. The theme is that in the presence of the Christ, the eternal and perfect Love Himself, the temporary nature of the other charismata is realized).

III. (*a*) If there be prophecy, it shall be done away,
If there be languages, they too shall cease to be.
If there be knowledge too, it shall be done away.

(*b*) We only know in part, in part we prophesy.
But when the perfect comes, that which is but in part
Shall then be done away.

(*c*) When in my infant years, I spoke as infant does,
I felt as infant does, reasoned as infant does,
But since I have become a man, the toys of infancy
Have all been done away.

ὁ ὀπισθόδομος (*the Treasury of the Temple, the fourth compartment. The theme is the treasures of the Temple of Love that pass not away and Love's pre-eminence*).

IV. (*a*) For through a mirror now we see
And in a riddle—then with face to face.

(*b*) In part my knowledge now, but fully then shall I
Know e'en as I myself was ever fully known.

(*c*) So must it be, faith, hope, and Love
Abide for aye, these treasures three.
Of them Love reigns supreme. Do ye pursue
The path of Love (xiv. 1), the highest road of all (xii. 31).

In the very centre of the Ode, the middle word of the middle line, in fact the "*omphalos*" (navel), to use a word associated with Pindar's odes, stands στέγει, the keynote of the song, the key of the problem, absolutely lost by the rendering "beareth" which is expressed by ὑπομένει, but which means Love *covereth* all things. Under His roof, His canopy of Love, all men move in safety. Hesychius gives κρύπτειν, conceal, as one of the meanings of this verb. Jebb on *Œdipus, T.* 11, points out that στέγειν in classical Greek means "to be proof against, *not to suffer*." Plato (*Rep.* 415 E.) used it of soldiers' billets "able to *cover* or shelter (στέγειν) them in summer and winter." Pindar (*Pyth.* iv. 81) used it of a protection against rain. Æschylus[1] used the word of a fort: "the fort *shelters* us." Grimm gives as the first meaning, "tegendo tueor." He to whom was said "I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof" (στέγη)[2] invites man to come under His Roof, under which *cover*[3] the homeless, lit. the roofless (ἄστεγοι), of Isaiah lviii. 7 find shelter. *Cf.* Wisdom (Sol.) v. 16: "With His Right Hand He will cover (σκεπάσει) them." στέγαι is used of a roofed palace by Herodotus (2. 2. 48); of a house by Sophocles, *O.T.* 637. Its special meaning is roof;[4] and the special work of a roof is to *cover*. This meaning is in harmony with the architectonic temple-like structure of the Ode. Pindar's scheme is set out in *Ol.* vi. 1-3, "placing golden pillars under the well-built vestibule we shall build, as it were, a splendid temple" (μέγαρον only of sacred buildings in Herodotus). The temples of Athena at Athens and of Diana at Ephesus had each four compartments. We have four corresponding divisions in ten of Pindar's odes—*e.g.*, the first Isthmian and second Pythian. These are connected with one another by some special link-

[1] στέγει δὲ πύργος (*S.C.T.*, 793), by keeping out the foemen.
[2] Matt. viii. 8; Luke vii. 6. [3] Plutarch, *Rom.* xxviii., ὑπὸ στέγῃ (under cover).
[4] *Hippolytus*, 469, the roof which covers the house, στέγην...ἧς κατηρεφεῖς δόμοι.

word or "responsion" like a door of communication.[1] In this Ode we have a similar kind of links, that between the first and second section being "that I may boast" (καυχήσωμαι);[2] the "responsion" to this is περπερεύεται, "is braggart," in the second section which emphasizes the absence of boastfulness in Love. The link between the second and third is "never faileth" (πίπτει), the third section describing the superseding of every other gift in contrast with the lastingness of Love. The link between the third and the fourth sections is "infant" (νήπιος), which suggests the contrast between the imperfect insight and shadowy[3] knowledge of the puerile present and the perfection of life and of the highest powers of the soul in a sphere of glorious vision and perfect knowledge which passeth not away. The closing words are "pursue love,"[4] as their metrical form shows. A reference has been made to Plato's metrical lines on *Eros*. His description of *Eros* personified has some resemblances to St. Paul's portraiture of *Agape*. "*Eros* neither injures (ἀδικεῖ) nor is injured by man or God."[5] "*Agape* rejoiceth not in injustice (ἀδικία)." "*Eros* does not show resentment, for violence has no part in *Eros*." "*Agape* is not provoked." Eros is distinguished by *good form*, for there is war between *Eros* and *bad form*, ἀσχημοσύνη (196 A), while "Agape does not show bad form" (ἀσχημονεῖ). "Eros produces *gentleness*[6] (*cf.* the *gentleness* of Christ, 2 Cor. x. 1), ostracizes wildness, loves to give us amity, will not give us enmity, propitious is to good men, may be seen by wise men and is admired of the gods, disarms hostility, fills with friendliness, is adornment of all gods and men, comrade, saviour, leader, loveliest and best, whom every singer must follow." St. Paul describes the disarming of opposition by *Agape*; His freedom from envy, rudeness, selfishness and His kindly offices. He might speak with the tongues of men and angels, but without this "adornment (κόσμος) of divine beings and men" his words would only have the ring of brass, and his life would be as worthless as that of those who played such instruments in the pagan processions. Plato bade the singer follow *Eros*. St. Paul bids the Christian pursue *Agape*. The resemblances, however, are only verbal, the differences are essential. Plato's *Eros*, however,

[1] See the *Nemean Odes of Pindar* (J. B. Bury), p. xx., on Mezger's discovery of the "responsions" in Pindar, "set words" acting like sign-posts.

[2] This is the reading of ℵ A. B καυθήσωμαι, a memory of the Neronian persecution, is evidently a Western reading, which spoils the harmony by introducing an anachronism and a harsh and false note, and an inharmonius sound.

[3] *Cf.* the cave-men in Plato's simile, who saw only the reflections of realities upon the wall, sitting with their backs to the light.

[4] διώκετε τὴν' Αγάπην. Dactyl with base and choriambus. *Cf. Iketides* (A), 526, παλαίφατον ἀμέτερον.

[5] *Symposium*, 196C. [6] πραότης.

beautifully described and poetically conceived, is to those who have read the hidden meaning, very remote in purity and spirituality from the White Christ, the *Agape* of St. Paul. This little poem, a Greek ode, is not only metrical, it obtains wonderful effects by assonance and repetition. The jingling effects of the words of the first verse represent the sounds of the musical instruments. The changes are rung like musical chimes upon certain words and phrases which recur at almost regular intervals, and which find echoes and "responsions" throughout as in the Pindaric odes, such as "if Love be not mine" and "it shall be done away." There is a prophetic personal note, which has been obscured by the strange *καυθήσωμαι*. The passage does not mean "though I give my body to be burned," but "though I give up my body"[1] to imprisonment or foes, to have something to boast about. This was written in A.D. 54, autumn; in May, 57, he did put his person in the power of his enemies.

The Ode, like Pindar's, is constructed upon architectonic principles. Love is the royal dwelling or *στέγη*, like the palace of the Atreidai (*Agam.*, 1055). Hecuba used the word of the treasure vaults of Athene (1009). Love is not only a palace, it is a treasure house. It is more, it is a divine residence, a temple in the highest sense, a place set apart for work and worship. The Abode of Love is like the Father's house (John xiv. 2), in which there are many abiding-places, places also to pass through, for the word *μοναί*, (*mansiones*) suggests progress on the road as well as rest, but only one roof (*στέγη*), the Divine Love that covers all men and things under the folds of its ample protection. The halls of hope and faith and love in that Temple abide (*μένει*). Their treasure can never be stolen from those who have found a shelter under the *roof* of Love (Matt. vi. 20 *f.*). This Ode, therefore, is "a God-built work" (*θεόδματον χρέος*), to use Pindar's description of his. It describes the Temple of Love, through whose many chambers men are permitted to pass, and of whose treasures, like the treasure of hope stored for future use (*ἀποκειμένη*) in the heavens (Col. i. 5), but pre-eminently Love Himself, they are admitted to a sight which is brief or lasting in the same degree as they possess the Spirit of Love.

St. Paul, a kindred spirit to Isaiah and the Psalmists, was a *vates sacer* as well as a theologian. In *Colossians* the full flow of his inspired eloquence carries him along into bursts of rhyth-

[1] There are examples of this idiom, *e.g.*, in Diodorus Siculus xvi. 93. Gelon the Syracusan gave himself up to the muleteers (*παρέδωκεν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα*). Maximus T. vii. 9 speaks of one who *gave his body* to Ætna. Appian of an orator who offered himself to any who would wish to arrest him.

mical cadences, daring metaphors—*e.g.*, "the image of the invisible God." His speech in the Areopagus, although a short summary, is a metrical impassioned utterance. He had the broad sympathies and the perfervid imagination of a true poet. His "insuppressive poetic mettle" finds a vent occasionally in hymn-like dithyrambs and measured rhapsodies like Romans viii. 31-39 and odes like 1 Cor. xiii. Dr. Norden, who writes disparagingly of the style of the Apostle, finds in Romans viii. and 1 Cor. xiii. the language of the heart as distinguished from the foolish chatter of the Sophists and the inwardness and enthusiasm of an inspired mystic such as we find in Plato and Cleantes. In these passages he says the diction of the Apostle rises to the height of the Platonic in the *Phædrus*: "Both have struck the note of the hymns, the Attic writer of the Dithyramb, the oriental Hellenist of the Psalm." He described 1 Cor. xiii. as "the highest flight of the Apostle's poetic art" (*Kunstprosa*, 509). Paul's secret power lay here, that he knew surely and felt deeply in his heart of hearts the beauty, splendour, glory and grace of a Life far above the wildest imaginings of the Greeks. In his moments of exultation his genius burst into songs, the most divine in the Divine Book, and therefore vastly superior in ethereal aspect, ecstatic rapture, soaring spirituality and intensity of feeling to all others outside that Book.

F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT*

I am honoured with an invitation to write a few pages about the great Bishop of Durham, Lightfoot, and especially to say something about subsequent discovery in the questions in which he was interested specially. The very charming book devoted to his memory by Bishop Eden and Canon Macdonald comes as a timely reminder to England what a great loss we sustained in his death, which interrupted a career that promised to be memorable and perhaps epoch-making in English history. The Bishop was a great scholar, but I venture to think that he would have proved to be even greater as an administrator.

Bishop Lightfoot rose over the horizon of my life in 1875, when, in preparation for the Final Schools at Oxford, it was necessary to profess *and to know* either the Thirty-Nine Articles or the Epistle to the Galatians (or some other alternative).

* *Lightfoot of Durham*. By G. R. Eden and F. C. Macdonald. Cambridge University Press. 1932. 7s. 6d. net.

I chose the Epistle, and purchased a copy of Lightfoot's edition. I have never ceased to be thankful that "Divvers" was compulsory.

The quality that attracted me in Lightfoot's edition was his transparent honesty: he was so careful to be scrupulously fair to every opinion, and to state it with perfect accuracy even though he differed from it. I procured all Lightfoot's other editions of the Epistles, and read them with equal care.

This quality of honesty in stating the opinions of others is by no means so common among scholars as might be expected. There are many whose statement of the opinions of others cannot be trusted: unconsciously they distort, while they state an opinion that they dislike, in preparation for demolishing it. I have often rejected an opinion at first, and later had to accept it; probably my statement of that opinion at first would not have been as fair as it was when I began to see that it was right.

Lightfoot was equally honest towards his subject, and spared no pains to make himself master of all that promised even remotely to aid full comprehension. One must work all round the text and the author: one must understand the author's life, the growth of his mind, the stage at which he was when he wrote the letter: that introduced chronology. One must understand every allusion and illustration thoroughly, and not merely look round to find the accepted opinion. There were many things that I did not understand, but I did appreciate Lightfoot's method: it is the method of all great scholars; I was familiar with it in German scholars, but Lightfoot added to it something personal and living. Mommsen had to a large degree a similar vivid quality: he believed intensely. So had a young German traveller, C. Buresch, whose enthusiastic spirit makes me always feel towards him as still living, though I knew him only by his letters, which suddenly stopped about forty years ago. I learned the reason only when a volume recording his life and death and containing his latest writings was sent me by his friend and teacher, the great scholar, O. Ribbeck.

Intense love for the truth guided Lightfoot as a scholar: intense love for mankind made him an administrator and a successful* administrator. The warm love of the earliest Christians for their fellow-men seemed to burn in his soul. The Church of England fitted and filled his whole life and nature, but his love for it was never narrow or hard; he felt that the world was wide; and his love was as wide as the world. He was "friend of all" (*πάντων φίλος*), a phrase often used in the epitaphs of the early Christians; it was common then because

* I venture to think that he was even greater as an administrator than as a scholar, if I may intrude beyond my own province.

it was true. The phrase had its origin probably among the pagans; but it acquired wider and more vital meaning among the Christians. I doubt whether it was much used in Christian epitaphs after the persecution of Diocletian had induced a narrower, harder spirit among them in the natural reaction against injustice.

How quaint are the chances that determine the preservation or annihilation of evidence. A rhetorician, Aristides, contemporary with the second half of Polycarp's life, lived much in Smyrna. He regarded the Christians as worms whose life wound its obscure way out of and into the earth, immeasurably remote from the interest of an educated man. It was a vulgarity unworthy of a rhetorician even to mention their name, and the rare allusions in which he admits their existence are so obscure and expressed in such rhetorical elaboration that many have found in them no reference to Christians, and have denied that Aristides knew of their existence. Yet it was this rhetorician's fate to preserve the evidence for the date of Polycarp's death, whose life was an offence to polite minds.*

Aristides suffered from an illness that lasted fourteen years, and he wrote an involved and confused account of certain incidents in those fourteen years—viz., actions and excursions suggested by divine interpositions in the life of a distinguished orator. This composition, styled "Sacred Logoi," is the most valueless of all his works (which are generally interesting, and show that there was ground for his fame as a rhetorician); but his allusions to contemporary governors of the province Asia bear on Polycarp, for the proconsul of Asia and the High Priest of Asia at Smyrna are named in the account which was sent by the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelion; Aristides mentions six proconsuls of Asia, with whom he came in contact during his illness, and one of them is the proconsul named in the Smyrnæan letter. Aristides does not date the governors whom he names; exact dating was vulgar; but he indicates in what year of his sickness he came into relation with them, and the years of his sickness can be determined approximately with some guesswork or argumentation. He was born under a certain conjunction of the planets and the signs of the zodiac, which recurs at intervals of twelve years; and thus the conclusion is reached that his birth took place in February-March, either of A.D. 117 or of 129. Eusebius, strange to say, preferred the later date, and Eusebius is a very high authority; one can imagine how loath was Lightfoot to abandon him in this one case.

* It is possible that Aristides saw the martyrdom, and thought that the educated world is troubled with one fanatic the less.

I was able to mention one or two fresh inscriptions relating to Julius Philippus of Tralleis, who presided as High Priest of Asia at the games held in Smyrna when Polycarp was burned, all tending to confirm the date as accepted from Waddington's elaborate argument and confirmed by Lightfoot's own investigations. He sent me the proofs which he had in hand of his long discussion; and I had the great happiness of finding that we held the same opinion on all details: the tenure and nature of the high priesthood of the deified Emperors. These matters all are interrelated: if one starts as he started with the wide survey of one definite all-embracing purpose, details fall into their proper place and order, and one cannot miss the truth; if one takes them singly, one can find many ingenious ways of missing what we both considered to be the truth.

It has taken fifty years to complete by discovery the investigation on which the Bishop was then engaged in those pages of his Polycarp; evidence had to be found on Asian stones and arranged in proper order. That process is long, but the reward comes when the fragments are fitted together. The result is to justify conclusively the views which the Bishop stated in those pages, and supported by a wealth of knowledge and close reasoning. The reasoning was long, and therefore not convincing to the world, which is always slow to accept an elaborate chain of ratiocination, for there are points at which the balance of evidence is delicate, and a slight counterweight might turn the scale. We know so little about past history: there is a vast background of the unrecorded; time has swept away many records which would be invaluable. It is something to have at last found the records which demonstrate that at every doubtful turning in the long discussion Lightfoot kept on in the straight and true course, where a swerve to the left or the right hand seemed tempting, and had been preferred by many scholars. Mommsen held the same view on most of the details, yet in one of his last writings he expressed strongly a wrong opinion about the issue of the discussion—viz., the date of the martyrdom. It chanced that the same mail which brought the request for the present article brought also an article in the last *Wiener Jahreshefte*, demonstrating from new evidence that the death of Saint Polycarp, the final cause of Lightfoot's long investigation, took place in A.D. 155.

To the wide scholarly interests of the Bishop I owe my introduction to him: he learned that I had found half of the altar which bore the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, a Phrygian Bishop, champion of the Orthodox faith against the Montanists in the second century, who became famous as the hero of a late romance of Edification, which describes him under the name

of Saint Aberkios as the evangelizer of pagan Phrygia. The real Bishop is described in Eusebius's Church History as protagonist of a struggle against heresy in an already Christian land. The romance, which contains many historical facts in its surroundings and setting, and yet is essentially unhistorical, bestows on its hero the epithet of Isapostolos, Equal of the Apostles. That title is a fragment of history imbedded in the romance: it was probably older than Apostolikos, and gave place to it; it is used in an inscription of the third century, where a certain Nestorios, evidently heretic, "shone like a star among the churches of God, bearing the title Isapostolos" (though the editor prints "bearing the honour Apostolos").* The romance acquired heretical associations, and was suspected by the Orthodox. Half of the altar was found in the modern bath-house at the hot springs of Hieropolis, where Avircius Marcellus was Bishop. The altar had been brought from Rome by the devil at the command of the Saint. It has now gone back to Rome, and is deposited in the Lateran Museum of Christian Antiquities. The hot healing springs had been produced on the prayer of the Saint, who pitied the sick and desired to aid their cure. There he prepared his grave at the age of seventy-two, and stood by while the epitaph which he had composed was inscribed on it, probably about the year 192. The epitaph breathes the spirit of its age; it is a testimony against Montanism, yet it is not controversial: it simply states the experience of the Bishop.

I was honoured by a letter from Lightfoot enquiring into the matter: so many great subjects are touched and adorned in the few lines engraved on that altar: the unity of the Church, the travels of the Bishop to Rome and beyond the Euphrates, through which he learned in practice and in fact that the belief and the action of the churches were the same in respect of the Holy Eucharist and the Virgin Mother. The Phrygian Bishop carried with him on his car the letters and message of Paul. All these and many other ideas caught Lightfoot's eager attention. He asked also about the evidence bearing on the date of St. Polycarp's martyrdom: had anything new been found bearing on that important point? another illustration of the value of chronological accuracy.

Lightfoot was necessarily interested in the answer to the question, Who were the Galatians to whom Paul wrote? Were they the Gaulish tribes who had settled as conquerors in a northern part of Asia Minor? or were they the people of Antioch,

* He reads *ὅθι ἀπόστολον ἔχων τι[μὴ]ν Χριστοῦ βασιλῆος* instead of *[ἰ]σαπόστολον ἔχων τίτλον Χριστοῦ βασιλῆος*.

Iconium, Derbe and Lystra, cities of Lycaonia, Phrygia, Isauria, but part of the Roman province Galatia? Without avoiding this question, and frankly stating his opinion, he brings no wealth of learning to bear on the subject. There was nothing to say. The country was unknown. Unfortunately a great French scholar, who had explored the tribal Galatia, made too short a visit, and contributed little, and that not very usefully marshalled. Let us now look at subsequent discovery bearing on the point.

A year or two before Lightfoot's death a great Austrian scholar published with wrong restoration and date an important inscription. It is a record of the Commune of the Galatians, a Provincial Council instituted by Augustus in his province. A meeting was held on the birthday of Augustus September 23, A.D. 101. It began with divine service (*i.e.*, of the gods-Emperors); it used Scriptures (γραφαί, doubtless ritual-books): the names of members are recorded, allowing for a few absences (probably 100). Cities are not mentioned, but the representative of Antioch was Sabinus Caristaniûs, of a family which had been great in Antioch since 11 B.C. in our records, and doubtless ever since the foundation of Colonia Antiochea. This family is known nowhere in the entire Empire except at Antioch. The representative of Iconium was named Ebourianos: during the next generation this family called themselves Ebourenos for several generations. The name is known nowhere else: it is Gaulish. The family probably was that of a Celtic tetrarch, who was expelled, when one of the tetrarchs murdered or expelled the others and made himself king and despot. The family settled in Iconium, and became noble and powerful there, the Ivy-family. Eboracum, our York, is the same name with a Celtic suffix in place of an Anatolian suffix. Several other Gaulish families escaped from Galatia in the same way: one is known at Pergamos, one at Thyatira, one at Eumenia.

Perhaps the representative of Lystra was Capito, son of Capito. A man of that name was at the Council, and a man of that name is mentioned in a village near Lystra; but the name is too common to have any demonstrative value.

Other councillors are from other cities of Phrygia and Lycaonia within the province Galatia. The Council bears the name Galatians; it had existed more than half a century when Paul wrote to the Galatians. What name could the Apostle give to those four cities, Claudian Iconium, Claudian Derbe, Roman Antioch, Roman Lystra, except that of the Roman province?

In the latest stage of opinion in Germany, Dr. Deissmann, a meritorious scholar, of course, retains his opinion; other

theologians are divided; but I mention only historians. The two most outstanding among ancient historians are Dessau and Ed. Meyer. Dessau in vol. ii., pt. ii. of his *History of the Empire*, 1930, describes in ch. xii. the unifying influence of the Roman rule (p. 584 *ff.*). Each province of Asia Minor comprised very diverse races, and imperial policy aimed at unification, so that ἡ Ἀσία τὸ ἔθνος should be the true Greek rendering of Asia Minor, though there were a dozen or more distinct ἔθνη. On p. 613 he mentions as a sign of the unifying power that after about fifty years of Roman rule the inhabitants of these lands, differing in speech and custom, called themselves Galatians: his authority is St. Paul, and he adds in a note: "On the Galatians of Paulus a right judgment is expressed by Ed. Meyer (with many others), *Urspr. des Chr.*, iii., 197 *ff.*: but Meyer errs in making difficulty about Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23." Meyer thought that the author of the Acts erred, but that his authority has no value against the clear word of Paul himself. Dessau saw that Luke and Paul agree on this matter, but that Luke must be translated correctly.

On December 7, A.D. 128, the World Society of Artists and Athletes met at Angora. The meeting began with the prescribed religious service of the imperial cult. It is hardly sufficiently recognized how deeply the imperial ritual permeated society, and how difficult it was for Christians to avoid being mixed with the worshippers (λειτουργοί). The Jews (perhaps also some Christians) countenanced the ritual as merely the accepted expression of loyalty. A Christian athlete has been found in Phrygia: he doubtless conformed. Jewish high priests of the Emperors are known. The rite was called "The Mystic (part of the) Agon." Immediately after that the Artists and Athletes proceeded to depart. The president of the games, Ulpius Ælius Pompeianus, hurried after them, and by promising large money prizes induced then to return and compete. Their reluctance will be understood by anyone that spends a winter in Angora: they were accustomed to compete in mild weather, even in hot summer, and were not clad to suit the cold winter of the Anatolian plateau: further, their performance could not be up to their standard.

There can be no doubt that the president of the Agon belonged to the province of which Angora was the capital. The metropolis managed the festival, and a wealthy provincial was appointed president. He represented the province Galatia, and he gained still further honour when his personal effort and the rich prizes that he offered saved the festival from being a fiasco. The president is well known. He was a Neapolitan of Pisidia. His father, M. Ulpius Pompeianus Pudens, made a

dedication of thanks to the god of Pisidian Antioch, about 99, when he was made a Roman citizen, for Antioch was near Neapolis, and its god was widely worshipped. Probably the president and his father had become wealthy by trading with Antioch; hence the dedication there.

Those men and many others were engaged in honorary work in the province at its Gaulish capital. They were Galatians in Galatia, men of Iconium, Lystra, Antioch, visiting their own capital.

If St. Paul's Galatians were the tribal Gauls, the letter would have to be placed later than Acts xviii. 23; for the letter iv. 13 mentions two visits to them. But it is the letter of a man who feels himself young and active, as Philemon is of a man who feels himself old. It is his first letter to Churches. Paul was strict in matters of chronology and loved to be precise: and Val. Weber in Germany and several English writers are right that the letter was written when Paul with Barnabas and others had been sent to Jerusalem (Acts xv. 2). They were on their way slowly (xv. 4), when he and the others (Gal. i. 2) heard the news which prompted the letter, in A.D. 49. Paul could not go to Galatia, for he had a duty in hand. He could not even promise a visit; this duty must be finished successfully. He wrote. He had made two progresses through the Churches, one in 45, the second in A.D. 47. Some alteration is needed in my former chronology: I was slow to grasp with what rapidity events moved after the great vision in the Temple in autumn A.D. 44 (Acts xxii. 17-21; Gal. ii. 7; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3): Acts xii. 25 suits a sudden departure, after a stay of some months in Jerusalem, beginning in June, or even in May, 44.

W. M. RAMSAY.

A THEOLOGICAL LEXICON TO THE NEW TESTAMENT*

THERE is no proper exegesis of the New Testament which does not depend upon a wrestling with the meaning of Greek words. The specific theme of the Bible is the relation between God and man; but the theme is presented to us in written words. The pages lie before us, and we have to decipher their meaning. The words are significant words; they contain a secret; and the secret is the nature of the relationship between God and man. It follows that unless we are prepared to treat words

* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, and published by W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1932.

as so many counters upon which we are free to inscribe any meaning we like, there is no escape from a severe and very troublesome linguistic discipline. And yet, is any English New Testament scholar really satisfied with the lexicons which lie on his table? Is he satisfied that he has comprehended the meaning of the words which the New Testament writers habitually use? Or, to put the matter in another way, are the many parish priests who week by week prepare their sermons on this or that passage from the Scriptures satisfied that the modern commentaries which they consult do really interpret the text as it stands, do really explain the actual words? We are bound to ask such questions as these, for if we do not formulate them, we shall never be in a position to understand the kind of problems which confront scholar and parish priest alike when they seriously set themselves to explain the New Testament.

It is greatly to the credit of our theological colleagues in Germany that they are acutely aware of the linguistic problem presented by the New Testament, that they have formulated the problem precisely, and that they are now engaged in a courageous attempt to solve it. No less than thirty-four competent New Testament scholars have combined to produce a "Theological Lexicon to the New Testament"—the emphasis lies on the word "Theological"—of which six fascicules have been issued, reaching down to and including the word *ἀπάτη*. Amongst those whom Professor Kittel of Tübingen has gathered round him will be found the names of men who are already familiar to readers of THEOLOGY—Rudolf Bultmann, Joachim Jeremias, Erik Peterson, Hermann Sasse, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, and Hans Freiherr von Soden. The Lexicon is dedicated to the octogenarian Adolf Schlatter, who retired last year from the chair which he has occupied at Tübingen so long and with so great distinction. This is indeed a massive combination, and it is not unimportant for English clergy and theologians to know what it is which has brought all these men together.

The title of the Lexicon recalls, and recalls intentionally, the title of Cremer's earlier work, which was issued under the heading—a "Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek." Cremer's Lexicon was first published in 1872, and ran through ten editions, the last being edited after Cremer's death by Julius Koegel in 1911. An English translation was published by T. and T. Clark in 1878, and again with supplements in 1886. So closely does Professor Kittel feel his work to be linked to that of Cremer, that his original intention was simply to prepare a new and revised edition of the earlier Lexicon. This was, however, found to be impossible, and he

has been compelled to embark upon a wholly new work. Nevertheless, the purpose of the new Lexicon remains the same as that of its predecessor. Convinced that Schleiermacher was right when he drew attention to the "power of Christianity to mould language," Professor Kittel and his collaborators have set out to mark and define the new significance and impress and energy which Greek words received when they were made use of by men whose whole manner of life and thought and speech had been subjected to a disturbance which radically altered both the starting-point and the goal of all their judgments.

It might, at first sight, appear that this precise definition of aim represents a reaction, or even a revolt, against the work of those many scholars who, during the past thirty years, have endeavoured to fix the meaning of Greek words current in the first century A.D., as it is displayed in the Papyri, or as it is illustrated in the surviving literary works of the Hellenistic Age. No spirit of reaction, still less of revolt, can, however, be detected in any of the articles which have as yet appeared or in Professor Kittel's preface to the whole work. Indeed, the work of Deissmann, of Preuschen and Bauer, of Moulton and Milligan, is expressly presumed, and it has been the competence of modern lexicographers which has made it difficult, if not impossible, simply to re-edit Cremer's Lexicon or even Julius Koegel's edition of it, though he took into account the evidence of the Papyri. The purpose of the new Lexicon is not to provide an alternative or competing work. It assumes the new knowledge and the new arrangement of old knowledge, and sets out to build upon them.

The New Testament writers did not invent a new language. They used, of course, current Greek words. It follows, therefore, that only when the range of the meaning of Greek words in extra-Biblical usage has been defined, is it possible to point out the affinity or difference of their Biblical meaning. It is with this latter analysis and comparison that the new Lexicon is concerned. If it can be shown that the meanings of words were deflected when they were made use of by the New Testament writers, and if the nature of this deflection can be detected and analyzed, we shall, as an earlier lexicographer had clearly perceived, have in our hands an important key to the "essential and fundamental ideas of Christendom" or, at least, of Primitive Christianity. The problem to which Professor Kittel and his collaborators have addressed themselves is, then, a necessary prolegomenon to a strict and proper theological interpretation of the New Testament; for, if a critical examination does show that the normal meaning of words has been deflected, it is difficult to think that the deflection is not a consequence of the

specific theme of the New Testament writers—namely, the relation between God and man.

The method adopted in the new Lexicon is not that which we normally associate with the making of a dictionary. The "statistical" method is left behind. The reader is not provided with a sequence of the different meanings attached to this or that word, supported by a few carefully selected quotations and backed by further references. He is presented with a series of essays, some of them very long essays, the purpose of which is to explain why a word changes its meaning, sometimes subtly, sometimes so completely as to have turned itself almost into its opposite. Moreover, the new Lexicon does not set out to handle every word which occurs in the New Testament. Those words only are dealt with to which attaches some "religious or theological significance." For other words the usual Lexicons are sufficient. This limitation, however, means that special attention is paid to significant proper names (Abel, Abraham, Adam), to significant numbers (εἷς, ἑπτά, δώδεκα, etc.), and to the more important prepositions (ἀντί, διά, ἐν, εἰς, συν, etc.).

Whilst Professor Kittel was preparing the Lexicon for the press, he delivered the Olaus-Petri lectures in the University of Upsala, and took as his subject "Primitive Christianity and the History of Religion."* In the course of these lectures, when he came to deal with the language of Primitive Christianity, he illustrated the problem which he and his collaborators in the new Lexicon were attempting to solve by referring to the very remarkable change in the meaning of the two words δόξα and κόσμος which is encountered in the New Testament when compared with the extra-Biblical literature. Outside the Bible the meaning of the word δόξα presents no particular problem. It means a notion or opinion or judgment, a conjecture or fancy. It means also an opinion which others have of a man, and so a man's reputation (see the new edition of the Liddell and Scott Lexicon). Even Philo shows no familiarity with any other meaning of the word. He uses it 180 times for "opinion" and sixty times for "reputation." Only once, and that in a quotation from the Book of Exodus, does he use it in its peculiar Biblical sense. What a different situation meets us in the New Testament! There the word is not once used for an "opinion," and only very rarely for "reputation" (*e.g.*, 1 Thess. ii. 6). Δόξα means in the New Testament the Glory of God. This is its fundamental meaning, but it is transferred first to Christ and then to the children of God. Its meaning has, in fact, been changed into its precise

* *Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum*, von Gerhard Kittel, verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1931. (See especially pp. 80-106.)

opposite. It means neither a fallible human opinion nor an equally uncertain human reputation. The word κόσμος is subjected to a somewhat similar disturbance. In normal Greek κόσμος means order, good behaviour, ornament, decoration; hence it came to denote the world as an orderly whole. In the New Testament, however, the word can be used to express that over which the Prince of Evil presides; in other words, the word which means "order" can express supreme disorder, a disorder in direct contrast with the wisdom of God. This is indeed a strange linguistic paradox, which is surely hardly sufficiently explained by saying that the "evil" sense of κόσμος "must be Jewish in origin" (Moulton-Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, article κόσμος). It is with these and such-like problems that the new Lexicon is concerned.

Some idea of the scope of the Lexicon may perhaps be gathered by readers of THEOLOGY from a summary of the article on "Abraham" and from a translation of the concluding paragraph of the long article on ἀγαπάω, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός.

Abraham appears in later Judaism as the national hero of his people. His figure is surrounded by legend and encircled by miracles. Hebron, where he was buried, was regarded as a sacred place. For the religion of Israel he was of great importance. In the midst of a world given over to idolatry, he saw the worthlessness of the worship of idols, and set himself to spread abroad the worship of the One God. He was both the first proselyte and the first missionary. Observing the whole Tora, although it was as yet unwritten, he became the shining example of loving obedience to the commandments of God. He was one of those righteous ones who did not sin. To the Hellenistic Jews he was the fulfilment of the Greek ideal of virtue. Moreover, he was also regarded as the supreme type of indestructible trust in God, maintained in ten temptations. This trust was reckoned to him by God as a meritorious achievement; and, as a reward, he became the Friend of God. To him was given the promise and the covenant upon which rested the prerogative of Israel. The merit of Abraham was credited to Israel vicariously, and his people were thus assisted unto eternal life. Consequently, physical descent from Abraham was treated as of the highest importance.

In the New Testament Abraham and Moses are the two Old Testament figures to whom reference is most frequently made. The importance of Abraham for the History of Salvation is recognized in the Gospels (Matt. viii. 11; Mark xii. 26 and parallels; Luke xvi. 22 *ff.*, xix. 9); but his glorification and panegyrics upon him are severely dealt with. Above him stands Jesus (John viii. 52-58), and, as the cosmic Rock, Peter is sub-

stituted for him (Matt. xvi. 18). Both Jesus and Primitive Christianity acknowledge that his children are Israel (Luke xiii. 16, xvi. 24 *ff.*, xix. 9, etc.); but unless the Jews repent, their appeal to Abraham is treated as illusion (John viii. 33; *cf.* Matt. iii. 9 and parallels). Moreover, the competence of Abraham to deliver his children from Hades is denied (Luke xvi. 26), and, above all, the Gentiles shall come and recline with Abraham at table (Matt. viii. 11). In John viii. 39 and in James ii. 21-24 he is the type of those who obey the will of God; but to Paul, immersed in the conflict with Judaistic Christianity, he is the example of those who are justified by faith only (Rom. iv. 1 *ff.*; Gal. iii. 6 *ff.*). Paul, therefore, saw in the Christians, whether of Jewish or of Gentile birth, the true Children of Abraham and the heirs of the promise made to him (Rom. iv. 12, ix. 7 *f.*; Gal. iii. 7, 9, 29, iv. 22 *ff.*; *cf.* James ii. 21; Heb. ii. 16, vi. 13 *ff.*). And so the deciding factor is henceforth not physical, but spiritual, descent from Abraham.

The concluding paragraph of the article upon ἀγαπάω and cognate words runs as follows: "To the Greek, then, the verb ἀγαπᾶν meant the sympathy and respect which a man displays towards his equals. On the other hand, to the Christian the word ἀγάπη moved round the recognition of the mercy of God and of the unworthiness of men in His presence. It is this spirit of Caritas which set the tone for the relation of the "brethren" with one another. And so, in the midst of a world which was to a very large extent overwhelmed by the power of "Eros," and was searching for a means of escape from itself by some kind of sublimated erotic, there appeared these young bands of "brethren," there emerged a Church, which knew of a Love which gives but does not desire. Here it is that the half-sensuous, half-supersensuous, twilight of the cultus of the Mystery Religions yields to the pure clarity of the μυστήρια τῆς ἀγάπης."

Enough has now been said to introduce the new Lexicon to readers of THEOLOGY. Those who read German ought to possess themselves of it. Those who have not this competence must hope that some enterprising publisher will dare to embark upon its translation, in order that it may become available to the generality of English students of the New Testament. In conclusion, it is difficult not to be envious of a country possessed of a sufficient number of technically trained New Testament scholars able both to perceive the nature of the real problems of New Testament lexicography and to combine in order to solve them, and then to have behind them a publisher willing to print the book so magnificently at a time when its production can hardly be an economic adventure.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNS.

THE WAY OUT FROM LITURGICAL CHAOS

THE Priests' Convention at Oxford was deeply moved by the picture which was there drawn of the bewildering differences in liturgical custom in the English Church, and of the real scandal which is given thereby.

The Chairman very wisely refused to allow a resolution on the subject to be moved; but it was impossible not to be stirred by the appeal of one member of the Convention that we should cease to talk, and at last do something about it. It is the sympathy of the present writer with that appeal, and his conviction that there is one thing which might be done, which moves him to write this article.

The situation is confessedly a difficult one. On the one hand we have an official rite, drawn up by Convocation in 1661 and imposed by Parliament in 1662. All priests who are instituted to a cure of souls in England and most of those who are licensed to minister in English churches have promised, as a condition of such institution or licence, to "use the form in the said Book and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." Even apart from any such promise it is a Catholic principle that priests must use a liturgy—*i.e.*, a form of words imposed by authority. It seems clear, therefore, that it is a duty to "use the form" of the English rite. If we substitute some other form, we are clearly breaking our word. On general principles, indeed, we might put the matter far more strongly. It might be expected that we should confine ourselves to that rite very strictly, and use it without any addition, subtraction, or substitution whatever. If the authorities demanded this, it would be impossible to refuse obedience. On the other hand, it must be frankly acknowledged that no one with any knowledge of liturgical form could be really satisfied with our service as it stands. In particular, the separation of the Giving of Thanks from the Consecration, and the Consecration from the act of Oblation, are inexcusable.

Various expedients are suggested by means of which it might be possible to bring the service back to some consistency with the principles of Christian liturgy without exposing ourselves to the charge of failing to "use the form" provided. Each of these suggestions has certain advantages, but it is widely felt that none of them is completely satisfactory.

1. It is sometimes urged that there can be no harm in simply adding the English Prayer of Oblation to the Consecration, either audibly or not, and keeping the final thanksgiving in the appointed place. The advantage of such a course would be

that an oblation would be made in connexion with the consecration without introducing anything alien to the English rite. But it cannot be asserted that this goes far enough to restore our service to anything like normality. The Giving of Thanks (the so-called Preface) and the Consecration are still separated, and the Prayer of Oblation has no *anamnesis*, which is an essential part of every other Catholic rite, and the most primitive feature of Christian liturgy.

2. Others have suggested—but the suggestion will raise doubts in many minds—that a mere alteration of order does not amount to an alteration of rite. If this were so, it would no doubt be possible to rearrange the parts of the English liturgy in an order far more satisfactory than that of 1661.

But once we begin on such a course there can hardly be any end to the process; and the unfortunate laity will literally never know what is coming next. Moreover, no amount of mere adjustment will restore the *anamnesis*; and, to some minds at any rate, a Mass without an *anamnesis* is hardly a Mass at all.*

3. It is, of course, quite allowable for the priest to use any private prayers he likes after the Consecration, and it seems obvious that he should take the opportunity of making his own *anamnesis* at this point: either in the Latin form or in that of 1549. No doubt many priests are accustomed to do this. But a purely private prayer hardly meets the situation: what is needed is something for the people to say Amen to. The Eucharistic Amen is the assent of the congregation not merely to the Consecration but to the whole complex act of sacrifice on its Godward side—Giving of Thanks, Prayer for the accomplishment of the Mystery, Commemoration of the Institution, *Anamnesis*, Oblation [Intercession], and Doxology. If the priest were to conclude such "private" prayer as the Latin priest does with an "ecphonesis," saying "World without end" aloud, the congregational *Amen* would gain enormously in meaning. But of course in that case the prayers after the Consecration would only be "private" in a somewhat legalistic sense.

Possibly this is the least unsatisfactory expedient for the present difficulties, but it cannot be denied that it does to some extent take liberties with the existing rite. It cannot be really satisfactory to overcome the deficiencies of one rite by mixing in parts of another.

It will no doubt be asserted that to write in this strain is to forget the existence of the proposed rite of 1928. Here it is necessary to use very temperate language, for warm feelings

* It is not suggested that an *anamnesis* is necessary for validity; but it does seem that our Lord's command to do this "for His memorial" is inadequately observed if there is only a memorial of the Institution and not also of the great redemptive acts.

are easily engendered. Let it be acknowledged, then, that there is nothing intrinsically non-Catholic about this form, that it is an improvement on the bare rite of 1661, and that Convocation has approved in advance the action of such Diocesan Bishops as shall give their individual sanction to the use of it. On the other hand, it is open to the objection that the form itself has no canonical status. This is very serious, inasmuch as the proposed rite apparently changes the method of consecration. *Prima facie* it is intended to complete the consecration by the *Epiclesis*, and not by the words of Institution. Of course, there is plenty of precedent for this, ancient and modern; there is even some Western precedent. But if we abandon the Roman and medieval view that Consecration necessarily depends on the words of Institution alone, it seems that we are driven to hold that the moment of consecration depends on the intention of the rite. It takes place at that point at which the rite intends it to take place.* Where do we stand, then, if this is not a "rite" at all in any canonical sense? and where do we stand if, as some assúre us, it was deliberately intended that the method of consecrating should be ambiguous? and where do we stand if, as Orthodox theologians aver, this *Epiclesis* is too indefinite to be a true consecratory form of the "Eastern" type?

Is it not intolerable that there should be any irregularity or any doubt about the very heart and centre of the service? To put it bluntly, can we be perfectly certain that without canonical authorization the 1928 service is valid? Probably it is: but the mere fact that a doubt can be suggested should surely make us hesitate to use it.

Is it, then, possible for those priests who are rightly discontented with the rite of 1661 as it stands to come to some agreement as to what they want? And how could they get it, if they did so agree?

The traditional desire of the supporters of the Catholic movement has been for the restoration of the rite of 1549 as an optional alternative. But many have felt serious objections to this suggestion.

(1) The combination of the Prayer for the Church with the Canon as an uninterrupted act has seemed likely to be tedious to ordinary folk. Many English priests have used the similar Scottish rite on their holidays, and they have often felt that the objection is a valid one.

* Some Anglican theologians dislike the idea of a "moment of consecration," on the grounds (1) that it is medieval, and (2) that the action of the Mass transcends time. But if we believe that the consecration effects some kind of *change*, we have inevitably brought in the category of time: and when once the question, "When is the consecration completed?" has been asked, it is difficult to refuse an answer.

(2) The prohibition of the Elevation would effectually damp the enthusiasm of most of those who might on other grounds desire this rite.

(3) The 1549 Calendar is, except for the inclusion of St. Mary Magdalene's Day, as jejune as that of 1661.

(2) and (3) are probably not weighty objections. The practice of Elevation and the enrichment of the Calendar are so widely practised that if the rite were ever sanctioned it is most unlikely that they would be forbidden. (1) is the serious matter. But Dr. Charles Harris informed the Convention that the considered view of the late Dr. F. E. Brightman was that the true solution of the Prayer-Book difficulty lay in the use of the rite of 1549 *with the Prayer for the Church shifted back to the position which is held by the corresponding Prayer of* 1661.

Was he not, as usual, right? Is not the 1549 rite, so amended, one which we could all use happily? It has an *anamnesis*, and an *epiclesis*, and a "Western" consecration, and a continuous canon, and the *Gloria in excelsis* in the traditional place. The ultra-Protestant second Act of Uniformity described it as "a very godly order"; and to many Catholic minds its canon seems superior in arrangement and clarity to the traditional Roman one. It is a native vernacular liturgy, the source and original of our present order. Nor need we hesitate about the position now suggested for the intercessions. There is ample precedent, primitive, Gallican, and even Roman, for associating them with the Offertory rather than with the Canon. Moreover, in the Scottish Book of 1637, a rite of the same type as 1549, the Prayer for the Church stands in this position.

There are three questions of detail in regard to the order of the rite about which the writer remembers that he once questioned Dr. Brightman: Is the connexion between *Kyrie* and Collect so vital that it ought not to be broken by the insertion of *Gloria in Excelsis*? Ought not the Intercessions to come *before* the Offertory? Is the position of the *Epiclesis* of the Holy Spirit before the commemoration of the Passion, Resurrection and Ascension a solecism? According to the best of his recollection Dr. Brightman's answer amounted in each case to saying, "It does not matter.".

Finally, what steps would have to be taken in order to authorize the use of such a rite? The question of authority is serious; but not quite so serious as is the case of the proposed rite of 1928. On the one hand, it is at least doubtful whether the Book of 1549 was ever submitted to Convocation; but on the other, it was for some years in actual possession as the English rite, and enforced as such by the Bishops. There was, moreover, no serious innovation as to the method of Conse-

cration: it is quite clear that the Consecration was to be completed in the traditional Western way by the recital of the words of Institution. The question of *validity* therefore cannot arise.

In normal circumstances there can be no doubt that the proper way to obtain authorization would be a synodical act of Convocation. There is little precedent for the imposition of a new rite or the restoration of an old one by merely Diocesan authority. There were no doubt many Diocesan *uses* in medieval times; but they were all variants of a rite which was far more widely extended. At the present time the Ambrosian rite is, nominally at least, the rite of a province, not a diocese: and the Diocesan rites of Lyons and Braga are survivals, not restorations.

But it is impossible to suppose that at the present moment Convocation would run the risk of solemnly enacting the re-authorization of the rite of 1549. The memories of the Prayer-Book controversy are too recent. After all, however, the ultimate unit in the Church is the Diocese, not the Province. It seems, therefore, that in the last resort a rite which is solemnly authorized by the act of a Diocesan Synod has sufficient spiritual authority, and could be used without violence to conscience. On the other hand, it would be highly undesirable that any change of such importance should be set in motion by the Dioceses acting quite independently. Such a course would fail to achieve the desired result of united action throughout the country.

Clearly the initiative should come from the Convocations. The recent precedent of their action after the rejection of the 1928 Book will help us here. But whereas on that occasion the matter was left, by an extraordinary extension of the *jus liturgicum*, to the individual action of the Bishops, the present suggestion is that the Convocations should commend the whole matter to the judgment of the *Diocesan Synods*, leaving them, if they thought good, to authorize the rite of 1549 as an alternative Diocesan rite.

Two points remain to be dealt with. It will be said that this plan would place the parishioners of each place at the mercy of the parish priest. But it would be perfectly feasible for the Bishop to reserve to himself the right of vetoing the use of the 1549 rite in any case where the priest was so unwise as to ignore the wishes of his parishioners in a matter of so great importance. What does *not* seem desirable, however, is to insist on the approval of the Parochial Church Council. A wise priest would probably consult his council; but to take a vote on a liturgical matter of this kind would be to employ the council for a purpose very different from its proper functions.

It may also be said that the country would never stand it. Having refused 1928, they would not tolerate 1549. But the objection in the popular mind to the book of 1928 was not the rite, but a certain rubric. It would be far wiser in this case to enact the rite and omit all rubrics. What is needed is not the rubrics, nor the *Propria* (which are very inadequate), but the Ordinary, altered as Brightman suggested, and the Canon. If these could be duly authorized a long step would have been taken towards producing order out of chaos. We should not have complete uniformity—who wants it ?—but a large majority of Catholic-minded priests would thankfully accept the new situation, and we should again be in possession of a rite which would bear comparison with any liturgy in Christendom.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE EPICLESIS IN THE 1549 AND 1928 RITES

I

AT the Oxford Priests' Convention in July, 1932, a strong lead was given in the direction of making the permissive use of the 1549 Rite a goal of Anglo-Catholic endeavour. The case may be stated thus:

1. The 1662 Consecration Prayer does not mention the Holy Spirit, an omission which cannot be defended.

2. If there is to be a mention of the part played by the Holy Spirit, it can only be in the traditional form of an Invocation.

3. In a Western Liturgy such Invocation must come before the "Words of Institution," or an apparent contradiction will arise between the implications of the customary form of Invocation and the Western teaching as to the moment of consecration.

4. Cranmer by a stroke of genius developed the implicit Epiclesis *before* the "Words of Institution" found in the Roman (and Sarum) Canon (*quam oblationem . . benedictam . . . facere digneris: ut nobis Corpus et Sanguinis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui . . .*, "This our offering . . . vouchsafe to bless . . . that it may become for us the body and blood of thy most beloved Son . . ."), into a formal Epiclesis combining Western and Eastern features. His phrase was: "With thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son. . . ."

5. The Second Act of Uniformity declared that the order of the First Prayer Book was "agreeable to the Word of God

and the primitive Church." Therefore, seeing that the Church of England in its most Protestant phase refused to condemn the 1549 Prayer of Consecration, those who opposed the sanctioning of it as a legalized alternative now would have a weak case.

II

The arguments on the other side are as follows:

1. If there is to be an Epiclesis at all, it should be in its historical place, after the Anamnesis. *Pentecost follows the Ascension.*

2. The original Roman Canon had the Epiclesis in this place, as is now generally recognized (see, *e.g.*, F. Cabrol, *Liturgical Prayer*, p. 74).* In the present Roman Canon the section *Supplices te* clearly represents the lost Epiclesis, of which only the prayer for worthy reception now remains. It is sufficient to point to the phrase "that these things be borne by the hands of thy holy Angel to thine altar on high, in the sight of thy divine Majesty." In the Syrian Jacobite Liturgy we have in the same position, associated with the Epiclesis: "That this oblation which we offer may be received in the presence of thy Majesty, upon thy spiritual altar, which is higher than the heavens, in the dwelling-place of angels. . . ."† And in *De Sacramentis*, the Italian Liturgy of *c.* 400, we have: "That thou wouldest receive this oblation on thy altar on high by the hands of thy angels"—immediately after the Anamnesis. The Heavenly Altar is too curious an expression for the collocation to be explained as a coincidence.

The so-called implicit Epiclesis in the earlier position (see I [4] above) is therefore the "preliminary Invocation," a special characteristic of the Alexandrian group of liturgies.‡ *Cf.* St. Mark: "Fill, O God, this sacrifice with the blessing which is from thee, by the descent upon it of thy all-holy Spirit" (Linton, p. 89). The developed Epiclesis in this position is a peculiarity of the Deir Balizeh fragments, which end with the Anamnesis, and in which presumably an Epiclesis followed in the ordinary place; but no argument can be founded on such enigmatic fragments.

3. It will be seen that Cranmer's phrasing was unique. It was "a deliberately composite structure . . . no parallel in either the East or the West" (Bp. Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, p. 49). We may regard it as a stroke of genius, but with equal reason as an eccentricity. Note the phrase "with

* *Cf. also* de la Taille, *Mysterium Fidei*, pp. 438-53; Fortescue, *The Mass*, p. 346.

† Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 47; *cf.* the Anaphora of Severus of Antioch on p. 53, "thy spiritual and supercelestial altar."

‡ We expect Rome to be more closely associated with Alexandria than with Antioch or Constantinople.

thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify . . . that they may be unto us. . . ." It is based upon Cranmer's studies of Justin and Irenæus. By "word" the "Words of Institution" are meant, not the Logos. See *Works of Cranmer relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Parker Society), p. 263, "consecrate by the prayer of his word" (quoting from Justin), and p. 266, where he interprets Irenæus' "after the word of God" as that "which you call the words of consecration." The phrase "thy Holy Spirit and word" therefore attempts to combine Eastern and Western theories of Consecration. It is a hybrid, not a natural growth.

4. This mediating position may appeal to some as suitably Anglican, *but will it really unite Anglo-Catholics*? Cranmer's experiment lasted so short a time that a restored 1549 Canon would have no roots in history. The striking thing is that subsequent developments have all been on different lines. The Epiclesis follows the Anamnesis in the Scottish Rite from 1637 onwards, and in the Nonjurors', American and South African Canons. The 1637 instance is noteworthy. Laud, with his passion for uniformity, would never have drafted a Canon for Scotland which in his opinion differed doctrinally from that of the English Book.

5. The needs of the Anglican Communion must be borne in mind. At present we have (*a*) no Epiclesis (English and Irish Books); (*b*) an Epiclesis in the later position (Scottish, American, S. African). If ever we had (*c*) a third type, with the Epiclesis in the earlier position, we should be multiplying our difficulties unnecessarily.

6. Lastly it must be remembered that the Alternative Liturgy of 1928 is being used to a certain extent, and there is no likelihood of the Bishops' giving such sanction to the 1549 Canon as they would not also give to the 1928 Canon. So that still more confusion would be in store for the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

III

Those priests who use the 1928 Canon presumably either hold that there is no moment of Consecration, but that the whole Canon is the consecration; or else they interpret the Epiclesis as a prayer for worthy reception. The first position is eminently satisfactory, and if it came to be generally held our difficulties would melt away. But will the second interpretation stand criticism? Let us examine the words, "With thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body

and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul." Note that it is "be," not "become." The easiest interpretation is: "that they may (so) be unto us . . . that we . . ." In this case they fall into line with the teaching of the Long Exhortation "for *then* we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood"—which is compatible with what follows, that, if we receive unworthily, we none the less do receive the Lord's Body and Blood, though to condemnation.

In the sixteenth century an English Prayer Book had to stand the test of translation into Latin. Would the manifest ambiguity of the 1928 Epiclesis be resolved in a similar case? (The ambiguity is obvious and the Bishops would probably not mind our saying that the *animus imponentis* was ambiguity.) The "thats" ("that" and "to the end that") would both be rendered by *ut*, and the stress would be on the final clause; perhaps we should translate "ut ita nobis sint Corpus et Sanguis . . . ut. . . ."

If, however, we turn to the Eastern Liturgies the meaning seems plain. No subordination of clauses is found in the Greek Liturgies, where the two "that" clauses are loosely co-ordinated with or without a connecting "and." The 1928 Epiclesis is Eastern in origin and, *if we must press this*, cannot be explained as merely a prayer for worthy reception. A clear example of the structure followed is found in the Liturgy of St. James: "that (ἵνα) he may come upon them . . . and may hallow and make this bread to be the Holy Body of Christ, and this cup to be the precious Blood of Christ, that (ἵνα) they may be to all those who partake of them for the remission of sins and for eternal life . . ." (Linton, p. 43; see also p. 38, Apostolic Constitutions; 63, St. Basil; 91, St. Mark; etc.)

An English document should, however, be interpreted by the light of English usage, not by the meaning of hypothetical sources in another language. Consequently the interpretation of the 1928 Epiclesis as a prayer for worthy reception is legitimate. Still those should not be blamed who cannot accept this view and something should be done to meet their wishes.

IV

I make accordingly a definite suggestion. That those who are dissatisfied with the 1662 Canon should accept the 1928 one under protest, interpreting its Epiclesis to mean a prayer for worthy reception and pressing for such modification as will make this clear. For myself, I prefer the view that the Prayer

of Consecration as a whole effects Consecration. But I see the force of the objection that since 1552 Consecration has been identified in English minds with the Words of Institution, and that to throw doubt on this is most disturbing. Those who lament the maimed Canon of 1662 ought not to be told that they must either continue as they are or else accept what seems to them an Eastern view of Consecration. The modification which would unite the Anglican Communion most would be one on American or South African lines.

The American form is: "Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood." The ambiguous "Word and" would be better omitted. (In this position, after the words "This is my Body, etc.," they can hardly refer back to these words. Nor presumably is the Logos meant.) The formula would then be a very solemn "saying grace"—"bless these gifts *to our use.*"

The South African form is even better: "We humbly beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction." This was the form adopted in 1924. The tentative form of 1919 ran: ". . . these thy gifts, *that he may hallow this oblation, and* that all we who are partakers. . . ."

The difficulty about the form of re-consecration would then disappear; but to obviate all possible scruples it would be well to add a rubric that it is sufficient to use the 1662 words.

It is generally desired to keep the Anglican Communion in close touch with the East as well as the West. The simpler we make the Epiclesis, the nearer we shall be to the Liturgy of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, which represents the parent rite of East and West alike. We shall then meet the objections of those who think that the developed Epiclesis is a fourth-century innovation. The form of Hippolytus as given by Linton (p. 31) is: "We beseech thee that thou wouldest send thy Holy Spirit upon this oblation of thy holy Church; and that joining them together thou wouldest grant it to all thy holy ones who partake, for fulfilment with the Holy Spirit and for the confirmation of faith in truth."*

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

* "Et petimus, ut mittas spiritum sanctum in oblationem sanctæ ecclesiæ; in unum congregans des omnibus, qui percipiunt, sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti in veritate" (Connolly, *Egyptian Church Order*, p. 176).

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

God and the World through Christian Eyes is the title of the attractive booklet published by the B.B.C. to introduce the series of twenty-five Sunday evening lectures on the Christian faith. Illustrations are an unusual, but pleasant, adjunct of the booklet, and recall the charming publication lists of the Cambridge University Press. The list of "Books to Read" at the end will be useful, though it might have been strengthened in certain directions; and we are glad to see that it is headed by a recommendation to read Dr. Edwyn Bevan's *Christianity*.

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

I am grateful to you for your reply to Canon Quick's letter in the October number of THEOLOGY, and I am entirely in agreement with what you say.

Probably by the time this letter reaches you the point at issue will almost have been forgotten; yet I do not like to remain silent in view of Canon Quick's courteous request to me to be more explicit. Canon Quick considers that I ought not to have been content to commit myself, without a full explanation, to the statement "In my opinion it is wrong in principle to depart from the Anglican rule that the celebrant of the Holy Communion is to be a priest." In writing this I was not concerned about the origin of the rule; I took the rule for granted. But you, Sir, have indicated the line of reply, if "the meaning of the rule and the ground and scope of the obligation it imposes" are called in question, in pointing out that, inasmuch as "the Eucharist is the Church's central and characteristic act of worship, it would appear to be necessary that it should be celebrated by someone duly authorized to represent the Church; and such due authorization appears to be lacking in the case of those not episcopally ordained."

If in the early days the Bishops themselves were regarded as the normal celebrants of the Church's Eucharist, it was recognized also that it was they who must determine who were to celebrate the Mysteries when they could not be present; and it will not be disputed that the rule requiring a priest for this ministry was already established at a very early date. In the sixteenth century in England, when controversy was raging with regard to the ministry, the Church of England quite deliberately committed itself to Episcopacy as against the claims of the Papacy on the one hand and the abandonment of the ancient ways by the Protestants on the other. With Episcopacy came the rule, set out in the Preface to the Ordinal, which requires episcopal ordination for the exercise of priestly functions, and which thus, *inter alia*, confines the celebration of the Eucharist to those who have been admitted to the priesthood.

This deliberate adherence to Episcopacy and its implications may be said to be the very *raison d'être* of Anglicanism, just as its surrender must always involve not only the abandonment of the Anglican position, but

also the withholding of that peculiar contribution to modern Christianity which Anglicanism seems called to make.

The rule in question, then, has a long history behind it, and it has been deliberately handed on to us by our forefathers in the face of strong temptations to surrender it. I may add that this rule now comes to us in this Province of India, Burma and Ceylon with redoubled force, for in the Constitution, solemnly accepted by us all, not only is it declared that " to no person except a Bishop or a Priest is it committed or allowed to celebrate the Holy Eucharist," but this statement occurs in one of the Declarations setting out the fundamentals of Catholic Faith and Order, concerning which we deliberately say that we claim no right of alteration. Is it not, then, reasonable to say that it is wrong in principle to depart from this rule? And further, in face of this rule, is it not reasonable to be at least doubtful whether the service of the Lord's Supper, conducted by a minister not episcopally ordained, is the Eucharist or not?

But there is one other point where I must join issue with Canon Quick. He considers that supposing one holds that such a service as is mentioned above either is " not the Eucharist at all " or that it cannot be said whether it be " the Eucharist or not," " the South Indian Scheme stands condemned in principle from the start." Here I disagree with him. In my opinion, if one takes the position that it is doubtful whether the service conducted by a minister not episcopally ordained is the Eucharist or not, the Scheme for Union is still just possible; *but its possibility depends on the Anglicans, who are involved in the Scheme, being strictly faithful to their own teaching and rules.* The question can be regarded in this way. The Scheme proposes the Union of Anglicans with certain Christians who are without an episcopal ministry (who for the sake of convenience I will term Nonconformists). The Nonconformists accept Episcopacy as the basis of the Union; but their ministers are conscientiously unable to accept what they regard as re-ordination. We say we are ready to inaugurate the Union with a period during which the parties will have the opportunity of growing together. From the outset all ordinations are to be episcopal. This means that the Nonconformist ministry will die out. In the meantime, however, the ministers may continue to minister to such congregations as are accustomed to their ministry. The Bishops may even give them a certificate to say that they are the duly authorized ministers of the Word and Sacrament *in that particular sphere.* But the Anglican Bishops (or rather *ex*-Anglican, for members of the united Church will not be either Anglicans or Presbyterians or Wesleyans) can still uphold their own rule with regard to the priesthood, and they can still teach those who have entered the Union with them that for Holy Communion it is their duty to seek the ministrations only of those who have been episcopally ordained.

As to the exact efficacy of the ministry of those not episcopally ordained they can refrain from any exact definition. They can at least say, however, that this ministry is no longer schismatic, for it has deliberately come within the jurisdiction of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. I grant that the whole Scheme bristles with difficulties and anomalies; but I ask, is it likely that Union can ever be brought about without such prickly accompaniments? In any case I came to the conclusion that the Scheme was an experiment worth making in the cause of Union. But I have always felt that from the point of view of Catholic Order everything depended upon Anglicans being absolutely loyal to their own principles,

even while they were ready to turn a blind eye to anomalies in other directions. It is just here that I feel that my brother Bishops have failed us. Three years before the Union can possibly be inaugurated they have acquiesced in our delegates departing from our rule about priestly ministrations, and they have justified this departure on the ground of "anticipation of the Union." They have thus already blurred the distinction between those ministers who are priests and those who are not. And now certainly "the South Indian Scheme stands condemned." But I hold that this is so not by its very nature, but so long as the recent action of the Bishops stands unrevoked.

Apologizing for not being so "commendably brief" as Canon Quick,

Yours very truly,

MARK COLOMBO.

P.S.—May I correct one misprint in my article in the August THEOLOGY? On page 76, the end of section 2, I did not write "Christian principles," but "Catholic principles."

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the October issue Father Dondeyne provides his account of the working of the liturgical system in the Latin Church before Charlemagne. The forms he studies lead him to certain liturgical conclusions. He holds that the Roman Church during the fifth and sixth centuries must have been the centre of an intense liturgical activity which exercised a wide-spread influence. He thinks that this influence passed to England and Gaul, where it enjoyed a wide diffusion. Father Cottiaux explores the leading conceptions of Abelard's theology. Two books have just been published upon him in English, and there is evidence of a return of interest in his teaching. He has much to say about the condemnation of Abelard's theology and the controversies, especially with St. Bernard, in which it involved him. Father Ghellinck discusses the "Opera dubia vel spuria" attributed to Peter Lombard. He maintains that Peter Lombard wrote the "Glossæ" on the Psalms, the "Glossæ" on St. Paul, the "Sermones" and the "Quatuor libri Sententiarum," but that he did not write the "Opera dubia vel spuria."

R. H. M.

Analecta Bollandiana. Tomus L.,—Fasc. iii. et iv.

The current number contains an interesting article on St. Romanus of Antioch, in which the passion of that saint is traced from its first somewhat bare account in the *Martyrs of Palestine* to its latest development. It is a good instance of the way in which the story of a perfectly authentic saint becomes embellished with legends and highly improbable details.

An article entitled *S. Patricius in Monte Cruachan Aighle* gives a Gaelic text from the Franciscan Convent, Dublin, describing St. Patrick's sojourn on the mountain in County Mayo, known as Croagh Patrick. It

also, mercifully, provides a Latin translation. The account enables us to see what a later generation thought the life of St. Patrick should have been. The ideal is, as we should expect, an extremely ascetic one. Patrick is made to spend the forty days of Lent on the top of the mountain "*ad similitudinem Christi.*" "By day he sang the Psalter through, said mass, and taught both his disciples and the crowd. He made the sign of the cross on his face a hundred times a day to protect himself from the machinations of the devil. At night he sang the Psalter again. During the last part of each night he remained in ice-cold water until his bones were frozen." The little sleep he allowed himself he took lying on a bare stone with another stone under his head, his only covering the skin of some beast dripping with icy water in which it had been dipped. He ate nothing and drank only a little dirty water. At other times, we are told, he ate once a day a little dry bread.

Nearly half the volume is given over to short reviews of *Publications Hagiographes*; of the total space allotted to these reviews about one-fifth is devoted to works published in Dublin, written by Irishmen, and dealing with Irish saints, a proportion which seems to indicate both racial zeal and extraordinary attention to hagiological studies on the part of scholars of the Free State.

C. P. S. C.

NOTE

THE CEYLON LITURGY

THIS proposed alternative Liturgy, after several revisions, is now in a semi-final form, having been approved by the Colombo Diocesan Synod and Council in September, 1932, by very large majorities, for submission to the Episcopal Synod of the Province, with a view to its being sanctioned for provisional use.

It will be condemned offhand by extreme "Westernizers" as a hybrid of East and West. But if ever conflation is justifiable it is in India, where the Anglican Communion and the Syrian Church of Malabar work side by side as two non-Roman Episcopal Communions. The resulting Rite is very beautiful and workmanlike and repays careful study. The compilers' desire to be faithful to English tradition is seen in the alternative positions allowed for the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the Ablutions.

The most striking Eastern feature is the part played by the Deacon in bidding to prayer, which is very edifying. To take the sections separately:

I. *A Devotion.*—This consists of Psalm 43 with its framework, the Confession being postponed.

II. *The Introduction* begins with the prayer for Purity (the Lord's Prayer is omitted, as in the present Scottish Rite) and goes on to the Confession and Absolution in the short form, the Kyrie, three-fold or nine-fold, leading up to the Collect. This is easily the best solution of the problem of two Confessions and Absolutions, which has gradually developed as devotional instinct has insisted on a Confession as an Introduction to the service. Before the Collect the *Gloria* "may be said or sung" on "Sundays (except in Advent, and on the Sundays from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday inclusive) and other greater feasts." On such

occasions, if it is omitted here it must be used before the Blessing. "The *Gloria* is a Roman element unknown to the Gallican rite . . . nor has any Eastern rite the *Gloria* in the liturgy. . . . Such later additions to the Mass . . . show they are not essential because they are not always said" (Fortescue, *The Mass*, pp. 243-4).

III. *The Ministry of the Word.*—This requires little comment. "*Alleluia* may be added to the responses before and after the Gospel from Easter Day to Trinity Sunday inclusive." The Creed is confined to Sundays and other Greater Feasts.

IV. *The Offertory.*—The priest says, "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God," to represent the Kiss of Peace in the Eastern Rites, which is found here as early as the Apostolic Constitutions (Brightman, p. 13). The sentences refer to offering generally or strike the note of the season.

V. *The Offertory Prayer* is almost as in the 1928 English Rite. But an alternative is provided by turning the several petitions into a Litany said by the Deacon on the Eastern model. Thus:

> "That it may please thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them who in this transitory life are in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity;
> *Hear us, we beseech thee.*"

VI. *The Consecration.*—The *Sursum Corda* and the *Sanctus* lead into the Prayer of Consecration, which takes up the thought of the *Sanctus*, beginning "Holy in truth art thou"—two sections taken with little change from the Liturgy of St. James. The next paragraph is: "Who, suffering death upon the Cross for our redemption, made there . . . until his coming again." The prayer continues: "*For*, in the same night . . . given thanks *to thee, O Father Almighty*, he *blessed it* and brake it, and gave . . . the Cup; and when he had given thanks *to thee*, he *blessed it*. . . ." The phrases in italics bring the Prayer into line with early liturgies. Probably εὐλογήσας and εὐχαριστήσας as in the Gospels are identical in meaning, but the fact that giving thanks to God *was* the way of blessing food requires two words in English, if it is to be understood.

The Anamnesis is as in the 1928 Book, but reads "his ascension into heaven, and his session in glory, and looking for his coming again." The reference to the Parousia is Eastern and doubtless dates back to the Apostles, for the primitive Eucharist was eschatological in tone. The Epiclesis runs: "And we beseech thee, most merciful Father, to hear us, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that they, being blessed and hallowed by his life-giving power, may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be sanctified both in body and soul, and preserved unto life everlasting." The emphasis differs slightly from that of the 1928 Canon, but the difference amounts to very little.

The Fraction is ordered at the concluding words of the Lord's Prayer, in addition to the breaking of the unconsecrated bread in the 1662 place. "The Peace of the Lord be always with you" follows the Lord's Prayer. The doubling of the Pax may be criticized (see IV. above), but since an introductory rubric provides for the dismissal of catechumens, the earlier occurrence at the beginning of the *missa fidelium* is appropriate, and the Pax in the Western position is too precious to be lost.

Benedictus qui venit follows here, as in the Apostolic Constitutions (Brightman, p. 24), a position which has much to recommend itself. "The practice of waiting till after the Consecration and then singing *Benedictus qui venit*—once common—is not allowed by the Vatican Gradual" (Fortescue, p. 323).

VII. *The Communion.*—The Deacon says "Draw near with faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to your comfort" (*cf.* the Byzantine Rite, "With the fear of God and faith and love draw near"), and the Priest says the Prayer of Humble Access. *Agnus Dei* comes next. The Words of Administration are "The Body of Christ, the Bread of Life," "The Blood of Christ, the Chalice of Life" (see Apostolic Constitutions, Brightman, p. 25, where, however, "the Bread of Life" does not occur). The Ablutions terminate this section.

VIII. *The Thanksgiving* consists of the Prayer of Thanksgiving from the English Rite, to which other prayers may be added, the *Gloria in Excelsis* if ordered and not already said or sung, and the Blessing. The Last Gospel is rightly excluded by a rubric ordering an immediate return to the Sanctuary. "It may still be questioned how far the Last Gospel is to be considered an element of the Mass, or rather of the prayers after Mass" (Fortescue, p. 394). Incomparable as an inspired meditation on the meaning of the Sacrament, it has no logical place after the dismissal, or, in the English Rite, the Blessing.

This beautiful Liturgy was drawn up by a Committee of nine Sinhalese priests, under the chairmanship of Dr. Ekanayake.

W. K. L. C.

REVIEWS

A History of the Church in Blackburnshire. By John Eyre Winstanley Wallis. S.P.C.K. 1932. 7s. 6d. net.

The importance of the Ribble, from its estuary to a point just above Clitheroe, as a political, linguistic, economic and ecclesiastical boundary from the fifth century down to the present day is strikingly evident from Canon Wallis's study of the ancient parishes of Blackburn and Whalley. Lancashire south of the Ribble has always been Mercian, looking towards Lichfield as its ecclesiastical head; the two more northerly parts of the county, Furness (or Stercaland) and Agmundernesse, hardly cut off from one another by the sands of Morecambe Bay, were settled by Northumbrians, and look to York. Later these districts received a strong Norse element from Ireland and the Western Isles coming across the Irish Sea, which joined hands with Danish settlers penetrating the Pennines from the direction of the plain of York.

Whenever an ecclesiastical province for Mercia is formed, history indicates Lichfield as the archiepiscopal see, with the lower Ribble forming the northern frontier of the province. The author does not state this explicitly, but the idea springs naturally from his exposition. It logically follows that Furness (here wittily termed Lancastria Irridenta) must some day be united ecclesiastically to Agmundernesse with Lancaster as the see city.

The problem of the development of parochial areas in the north of England is illuminated by recent research. It appears that the manorial system does not entirely fit the conditions in the North. "All over Northumbria the English unit of lordship was not the manor, as it prevailed in the southern parts of the island, but the shire." "The shire was an area of considerable size, composed of a number of townships or vills, which combined to support a central town or caput." Thus Blackburnshire appeared to the Domesday surveyors as a manor, but contained twenty-eight townships which also seemed to be manors. The large area consequently was called "a manor or hundred," the smaller areas were described as held "for manors." Whereas in the south the ancient parishes generally coincide with the manors, in the north they were generally coterminous with the hundreds or shires.

Canon Wallis has an interesting story to tell of the early appearance of a Rural Deanery of Whalley with the office of Rural Dean attached to one family, which provided a sequence of Rectors none of whom seem to have been in Priest's Orders.

Under these Deans of Whalley the Churches within the Deanery were gradually degraded into Parochial Chapelries and went to form one huge Parish of Whalley. Under the spur of the economic development of Lancashire during the last century the process of re-establishing separate parishes which began much earlier was completed. The author gives reasons for believing that this process has now come to an end. The story is rounded off by an account of the setting up of the diocese of Blackburn by a Church Assembly Measure.

Closely linked with the parochial history is the account of the removal to Whalley of the Cistercian community from Stanlaw in Cheshire. Whalley Abbey fell in 1536 as a direct result of the Pilgrimage of Grace.

Though Blackburnshire gives the title to the book, Whalley is necessarily the centre of interest, and the author is able to supplement the information given by his illustrious predecessor Dr. Whittaker and correct some of that great historian's misapprehensions. The volume is illustrated by several informative sketch-maps, a plan of Whalley Church and a folding plan of the ruins of Whalley Abbey, where recent excavations have revealed details that were hitherto obscure.

We note with interest that in the year 1296 a dispute arose between the parishioners and the Rector of Whalley as to the liability for providing coverings for the altar. The point at issue must have been much to the fore about that time, as we find a canon of Robert Winchelsea very near this date dealing with the matter, and for the northern province a similar canon was enacted some fifty years earlier.

Canon Wallis is so accurate and well informed that it is no disparagement of his work to call attention to one slight inaccuracy. Misled, no doubt, by the existence of Edisford Hall, now a farmhouse, but formerly the old manor-house of the Colthursts, he states that the Lazar-house of Edisford stood on the right bank of the Ribble. All the evidence goes to show that the hospital stood within the borough of Clitheroe on the opposite bank: Edisford Hall and its history belong to the parish of Mitton in Yorkshire and have no connection with Whalley or Blackburnshire.

FRED. G. ACKERLEY.

RELIGION AND REVELATION. A Study of some Moments in the Effort of Christian Theology to define their Relations. The Paddock Lectures for 1931. By A. L. Lilley. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

This book is interesting and valuable for its careful statement of the problem, and in particular for the attention paid to the

great mediæval scholastics, with the object not of blaming their narrowness but of admiring their largeness of view. But it is not satisfying, and one has a sense that the author himself is not really happy with his solution. He takes as the universal and standard Christian conception of Revelation that which was reaffirmed by the Vatican Council of 1870, that Revelation is he declaration of necessary truths about God to the mind of man, conveyed in the Scriptures and guaranteed by miracle; this conception received its classical formulation in Scholasticism. But modern critical study of the Scriptures makes it impossible for us so to accept them; what is to be the solution? The answer which emerges in the last chapter is that the real revelation is that of religious experience; all religion is in its degree revelational, and the highest religion has the highest revelational value. "The revelation as received is not infallible truth caught in the net of clear, sufficient, inerrant statement, but an intimate personal certainty too great for words which are not possessed by its transfigured glow" (p. 145).

But it is necessary to enter an emphatic protest against the claim that the scholastic conception of Revelation is the classical teaching of the Church. First of all, it is emphatically not the view of the New Testament. In the New Testament, the Revelation of God does not consist in our Lord's enunciation of truths about God; the Revelation *is* the Lord Himself. He, not His teaching, is the Divine Logos. That which is revealed is not a truth about God, but God Himself, personally manifested in His Son. God is Agape, and in Jesus the Divine Agape is revealed, coming to man to seek and to save. The Revelation is not primarily a truth addressed to our minds, but a Reality, the concrete reality of the Manhood of the Christ, coming to men and making the demand of faith—that is, primarily, not intellectual belief, but the response of the whole man. His demand comes as a shock and challenge; yet in accepting the challenge men know that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. First, therefore, comes the impact of Christ, and man's response; but then, immediately, comes the question, Who is He? The New Testament contains various statements of the answer: He is Messiah (in His own, not the conventional sense), the "Servant," the Lord, the Divine Wisdom, the Logos, the only-begotten Son of God. The answer is further defined in the credal and conciliar formulæ, which erect the necessary barriers round the Revelation; but all the time, the Revelation consists in the Son of God Himself, not in the letter of Scripture, nor in the formulæ: the letter killeth.

By this faith the Church has lived. Canon Lilley never once mentions the Cross of Christ in connection with Revelation;

yet to the Church the Cross has ever been the supreme Revelation of the Divine Agape, mysterious because unfathomable. In the eucharistic mystery the Church has this Revelation constantly set before her; and this holds a far more central place in the Church's actual apprehension of Divine Revelation than any purely intellectual formulation of revealed truth.

It is indeed true that the permeation of Christian thought by Aristotelianism since the thirteenth century has succeeded in intellectualizing Christian theology to such an extent that it can be taken for granted, as in this book, that Revelation means to the Church the disclosing of truths about God, and faith means right belief. With such a view, the "truth" of the Scriptures could hardly fail to be interpreted as "freedom from error"; the doctrine of verbal inspiration was taken over by Protestantism and emphasized; but it was not till the panic caused by the arrival of Biblical Criticism that it really became the key-point of the theological defences.

So long as this intellectualistic view-point is assumed, we seem to have a choice of either accepting the Vatican Council and denouncing Criticism, or accepting Criticism and adopting the view of Canon Lilley and of the Roman Catholic Modernists of thirty years ago, that all religion is in its degree revelational, all religions are going the same way, and Christianity is the best of the bunch. But this is quite evidently the surrender of historic Christianity; our Lord now becomes Divine only in the sense of being "the highest human," and there is no redemption by the Cross; Christianity is gone, and in its place we have Religion.

But as soon as we escape from the scholastic to the New Testament conception of Revelation, the dilemma disappears. God Himself has been manifested in Christ; and because the Revelation is claimed to have taken place in history, we are not merely permitted but compelled to investigate the historical records with the fullest freedom. There will be a tension between faith and history; but the investigation cannot be shirked. And finally, such a method of approach satisfies the point raised by Canon Lilley, that "revealed truth is of the nature of poetic symbolism, not of the clear-cut and sufficient statements of the logical reason" (p. 116). For if the Revelation is of God manifest in the flesh, its fulness and richness will far surpass the power of rational formulation to comprehend it: the Reality that is revealed will require for its apprehension the help also of parabolic symbolism, of art and music; and at the last it will remain a mystery, deeper than our apprehension can fathom. For, as the Athanasian symbol says, the Son and the Holy Ghost, no less than the Father, are "incomprehensible."

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

NOTICES

THE SOUL OF AN AFRICAN PADRE. By the Rev. Godfrey Callaway, S.J.J.E. A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 3s. 6d.

This collection of Letters from a South African Native Priest cannot be better described than in the Foreword: "This African Padre is imaginary, and yet, I venture to think, he does in a certain sense exist. He is an African who is rooted in Africa, with a passionate love of his country and of his own people. He has also assimilated the culture of Europe, and reverences the nation, Great Britain, through which he has absorbed it. In addition he is an earnest and devoted priest. Such men, even in the making, may be few, but they are destined to be the builders of the bridge of mutual understanding and mutual respect between the White and the Black of South Africa. It is with the longing to encourage the building of that bridge that these Letters are written. There is much in them that is the record of actual experience, and much that is not. Yet I do not think that there is anything that could not be matched by fact." The difficulties of the work, and the racial problem, are described with a clear-headed, fair-minded sympathy, and a rare insight and far-sightedness. It is, besides, a collection of the most delightful sketches of Native life in the Transkei, of rare beauty and humour and interest. It is a most happy thing to have produced this book at the time when the work described, round about the S.S.J.E. Mission at St. Cuthbert's, Tsolo, is celebrating its Jubilee.

V. I. RUFFER.

THE TESTAMENT OF LIGHT. An anthology. Edited by Gerald Bullet. J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 5s.

"This is an anthology of the religious spirit," of numerous quotations from Blake, Traherne, Jeremy Taylor, Marcus Aurelius, Penn, Santayana, Jeffries, Unamuno, H. G. Wells, while Confucius, Dostoyevski, Nietzche, Lao-Tze, Rabelais, Spinoza, and Wordsworth are also represented, besides others of less repute. The notes reveal that the editor cherishes a great deal of prejudice, a thing he bitterly decries in others. There is much about Love in the anthology, but one finishes the notes wondering how much the editor really knows of Love. The pontifical tone precludes a sense of humour, but the cordially detested traditionalist may derive some unintended amusement from this compilation. The beginning of St. John's Gospel is rendered: "In the beginning was Imagination . . ." The two Prayer Book Collects are described as "poetical apostrophes to that nobler part of our common humanity which is called, variously, God, the Christ, the Inner Light, and so on." (The whole of that note is a gem.) Gibbon is the accepted authority on the early Christians.

V. I. RUFFER.

WINFRID BURROWS. By Mary Moore. S.P.C.K. 5s.

This unpretentious little book, the tribute of an only child to the memory of a beloved father, will on that account be more welcome to many readers who knew the late Bishop Burrows than a more elaborate biography would have been. The simplicity and naturalness with which Lady Moore tells her story are commendably attractive, though literary

purists may discern that she is not a practised writer. Her father would probably have corrected her for writing of his "four last" friends, for instance—or would have done so had she been his chaplain and invested with the responsibility of writing his letters for him.

But there will be little disposition to find fault with a narrative at once so ingenuous and so revealing. In these pages we are made to see the subject, boy and man, as he appeared to his intimate circle and trusted colleagues throughout a distinguished and laborious career. The study is not overloaded with detail but is so wisely documented that nothing of cardinal importance has been omitted which could throw light on the aims and activities of a personality to whom the Church of England in our time owes much. Thus we are allowed to read some of his mother's early letters to him and his to her, and a selection from those of his friends and preceptors, concluding with an admirable and informing epilogue by the Bishop of Manchester, who was in close co-operation with him in ecclesiastical business in his later years.

Nor are we given a mere eulogy of a scholar, pastor, and bishop. No one who served under Dr. Burrows could fail to respect him, both for his intellectual distinction and high character, but there may be some coming within this category who will now learn for the first time of his rare spirituality and tenderness of heart. No more humble-minded servant of God has occupied an influential station in our day, yet this quality was concealed from casual acquaintances by a veil of reserve and an abrupt manner of speech. Like the late Bishop Gore, he had no small talk, and was apt to render interviewers nervous on occasion by an outward asperity that was neither more nor less than the form assumed by shyness. This is a fact well brought out in the present volume. "It is rather pathetic that a man so reserved, often unhandy with new acquaintance, sometimes impressing people as inhuman, should in his own mind have considered simple usefulness to ordinary people so far more worth while than intellectual achievements. But he did, and in his teens his instinct led him right; he was not made to be a student all his life."

His brilliant academic career did not disqualify him for becoming an excellent administrator and man of affairs who has left his mark on at least two great developments in the Church life of our time—the training of candidates for the ministry and the preparation of the revised Prayer Book with its far-reaching effect on the public worship of present and future, notwithstanding its rejection by the House of Commons.

He was happy in being permitted to die in harness, greatly though the effort to continue at his post cost him in physical suffering. And all who esteemed him are happy in possessing his daughter's record of what he was and did in his seventy years of life on earth.

R. J. CAMPBELL.

LIVING ISSUES IN CHINA. By H. T. Hodgkin. George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 5s.

The theme of the book is that the impact on China has had terrible results, and that it is our plain duty to make Western contacts as Christian as possible. The author has had twelve years' experience of work in China as a medical missionary. China is feeling painfully after national unity. It is in the stage of the Wars of the Roses. Armies of hired soldiers fight each other at the bidding of rival war lords. The pressure of Japan

has unintentionally helped to create a Chinese national consciousness. Passionately desirous of achieving equal status with other nations, China is deeply humiliated by the affronts to her nationality from the Powers during the second half of the nineteenth century. In the midst of all manner of contesting forces, such as Nationalism and Communism, Chinese Christians are portrayed as full of a vigorous determination and as feeling their way to a united and indigenous Church.

H. Lovell Clarke.

Prophets of Judah on the Background of History. By Ursula Wells, S.Th., L.T. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

A new factor in Church life is the growing number of women with a theological education. Here is a book by one who combines the gift of lucid teaching with a thorough acquaintance with the background of the period spanned by the Old Testament prophets. It is well arranged, concise, well adapted to its purpose, namely, the study of the prophets by those without technical theological education. At every stage the historical situation is shown. The reader is helped to realize, in the background of Jewish history during these four centuries, the fact and the policies of the three great empires located successively in Mesopotamia, which held the Jews in subjection. The sequence of the development of the ideas of the prophets is set forth, and the reader is made to feel the relevance of the message of the prophets to the present day, when great world forces and ideas are struggling for the mastery, and faith in God is being tested and purified, as it was in the days when the Jews came to realize the competence of the spiritual ideal to confront and to master secular forces which seemed to be crushing and insuperable.

H. Lovell Clarke.

Three books on the Oxford Movement:

John Keble. By Lord Irwin. Mowbray. 5s.

The Oxford Movement and After. By C. P. S. Clarke. Mowbray. 8s. 6d.

A Tractarian at Work. By J. F. Briscoe and H. F. B. Mackay. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

These are all good. The first is a reprint of a volume published twenty years ago. It would have been a notable gain if we could have had it rewritten by an author who has since then been a Viceroy of India and is now Minister of Education. But that was no doubt too much to expect, and it was worth republishing just as it was. It contains a good account of Keble's life, some very sagacious comments, particularly in the chapter headed "Church and State," and a just appreciation of the poems. Lord Irwin understands the remarkable combination of utter humility in worldly or personal things and adamantine firmness where truth was imperilled or principles outraged, which made up Keble's moral character. And he does justice to Keble's inner life of devotion and his love and care for his country parish.

Canon Clarke's book has not a little original research behind it. He has had access to some unpublished documents, and he covers the whole ground skilfully and well. His narrative is occasionally too compressed, and so loses some of its interest, but he gives readers a great deal—for his

space an astonishing amount—of careful history, and some penetrating comments. He carries on his story to the present day. A very accurate, sensible and useful volume.

The "Tractarian at Work" is R. W. Randall. It was an excellent idea to recover the story of one who was in most ways a typical Tractarian, and yet was *sui generis*. To have succeeded Manning at Lavington in 1850, to have built up from the beginning the great fabric, material and spiritual, of All Saints, Clifton, and then to have become a Dean—these things make up an instructive life. And the authors have made of it a most instructive "Life." Some readers will get a rap on the knuckles here and there, but they will be grateful for the picture. Randall's father, "difficulties" in the village, the triumph of All Saints, and the disappointments of Chichester—all is told with a sure touch.

S. C. CARPENTER.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. (Moffatt New Testament Commentary.) By C. H. Dodd, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

A busy man may be pardoned if he feels bewildered by the rapid changes of our time and, in particular, if he finds himself unable to keep up with the new presentation of positive Protestantism by Barth and his followers, and by allied movements. The very effort to understand a recent book on these lines is serious, so strange is the mode of thought to the average Anglican. Perhaps the best thing to do is to return to the source of their inspiration, the Epistle to the Romans, in a modern-minded commentary, by which I mean one which, based on up-to-date knowledge of critical results, yet says as little as possible about mystery religions and the like and is primarily theological. The ideal book is Professor Dodd's new commentary.

Dr. Moffatt's version is printed as a text, though often criticised. No knowledge of Greek is assumed in the reader. The three elements of sound exegesis are carefully distinguished—St. Paul's message, the form in which he expressed it for a particular need, and its meaning for us today. The treatment is wonderfully fresh and often provides both simplification and enlightenment.

To give some examples. The argument about the faith of Abraham before the Law was given is still valid; only we should say that the characteristic stories about Abraham were written in the prophetic period before the codification of the Law. "Our old man was crucified" (vi. 6), represents what we should call the crushing of bad sentiments in order that they may be re-integrated around a new centre—Christ. "*Reckon* ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin" (vi. 11) shows that Baptism for St. Paul's thinking did not act as a magic charm. Illustrations from slavery are not helpful nowadays, when a man *can* serve two masters, since the employer buys only a part of his time. "Abba! Father!" is an ecstatic cry uttered frequently at gatherings of the faithful; as is well known, foreign words are often used on such occasions. "God is the Father of all men, but not all men are His sons" (p. 131, *cf.* Matt. v. 45, "that ye may be sons of your Father in heaven").

Certain severe judgments are regrettable, such as: "The whole argument of iii. 1-8 is obscure and feeble," and: "We cannot help contrasting his laboured and blundering allegories with the masterly parables of Jesus . . . Paul flounders among the images he has tried to evoke."

An Oxford tutor, it is said, once read a theological essay in silence, his pupil sitting by his side, and when he reached the end pencilled: "It is a sound rule—never patronize an Apostle." It is still sounder not to pass harsh judgments upon an Apostle. It is unfair to compare St. Paul with the Son of Man. And how do we know that the parts of the Epistles thus condemned were not the most effective for their purpose? It is a truism that the more consciously topical we are the less we appeal to the next generation.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Saint John of the Cross. By Fr. Bruno, O.D.C. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

In his preface to the above work M. Jacques Maritain, noting the author's method of reconstructing, according to the probabilities of the case, details of place and circumstance calculated to add to the veracity and living reality of his background, remarks, after having confessed to a certain lack of sympathy for biography much ornamented by picturesqueness: "Yet I realize that many think differently, and that Fr. Bruno, in any case, always interests and certainly instructs—whether he . . . depicts the landscapes of Andalusia . . . or faithfully notes every interesting fact, be it the age of a nun or the physical features of a monk, leaving no definite detail in the shade." He also mentions the author's "meticulous anxiety to note and tell us everything," reminding us that its basis is a great and praiseworthy love of truth. But a careful reading of this long and absorbing book—which is, unusually enough, both painstaking and inspired—is apt to result in the conviction that, as is so easy, the author has slipped a little into the bog of over-interest, has steeped himself just a little too completely in the events he desires to reconstruct, and has become so far contemporaneous with the period of which he is treating that he has, to a certain extent, lost the power to stand back from his picture and view it as a whole.

The book is indeed on all counts a model for biographers a little too addicted to the Strachey-istic mode, for its author uses similar methods but in a more balanced and more restrained manner. But it is his love for the saint and his intense interest in all the circumstances which surrounded his earthly sojourn which have tempted Fr. Bruno to delve perhaps a little too deeply into the intricate and barren places of the great controversy which brought St. John of the Cross his much desired "martyrdom." By doing this the book falls between two stools, since scholars undoubtedly know already the whole story and hardly need such a book—a monograph on any special point on which new light is thrown would be more to the point for such a public—and to the general reader the accumulation of facts, names, and obscure issues will certainly appear more than a little alarming. In fact, the editor, Fr. Zimmerman, in his postscript, places the whole controversy in its true perspective much more clearly, and it falls in where it belongs—into the farther reaches of the landscape, a sad but distant monument to the human folly and pettiness which obtrudes itself into the very midst of holiness, and rears itself up even in high places. The last two paragraphs of the book proper show very clearly the method of the author: their touching simplicity and the memorable poetry of the telling leave a sharp clear vision in the mind,

and bring a courageous and painstaking book to a close on a moving note: "As he (John's brother) was walking along, towards those blue-black mountains, that grow greener as one moves towards them along the white road, he raised to his lips a small fragment of the sacred flesh which Doña Ana had given him for himself, and which he was to keep on an altar or, on great feast-days, carry about him, in a little bag slung round his neck. He put his whole heart and soul into that kiss: 'O hermano: O my brother,' said he, 'how is it that you have gone and left me?' And immediately a sweet perfume—even sweeter than that emanating from the relics of Mother Teresa at Medina—was diffused, which consoled him to such a degree as he could not express—marvellously.

"But clouds were piling up, the heavens grew dark. A whirlwind arose—and they are terrible in these districts. 'Hermano,' cried Francisco, 'I believe you are in Heaven. Save me from this danger; I do not know where I am.' The hurricane still raged. He then called on the Virgin of Carmel: 'Mother of God, I recommend myself to you. By the great services my brother rendered you, save me!' Suddenly the tempest ceased, and the sun shone out."

OLGA LEVERTOFF.

THE AUTHENTIC PHOTOGRAPH OF CHRIST. By Kazimir de Proszynski, M.E. (Liège), F.R.P.S. (London). Edited with an Historical Supplement by Hugh J. Schonfield. The Search Publishing Co., Ltd. 5s.

No reader of THEOLOGY, nor anyone else, need trouble to read this attempt to vindicate a piece of mediæval manufacture by the aid of modern photography. Both are suspect. The shroud described in this publication has no reliable literary history before the twelfth century, that era when the fabrication and dissemination of relics was rampant. The capacity of the camera for faking what it desires to prove has been too often exposed to allow us to give much credit to it in this instance. This particular relic was condemned by the authorities of the Church in the Middle Ages, and expert Roman Catholic opinion today has not revised the decision. Not a single historical authority of even the second or third rank is quoted in support of the credentials of the shroud. We should like to have the opinion of an anatomist on the representation here given of a human figure. The author claims that the shroud bears out the New Testament account of the Lord's embalmment, and he quotes all the relevant passages. He does not deal with the discrepancy created by the fact that St. John tells us that Christ's head was bound up with a separate cloth. Nor does he deal with the difficulty that His body is reported to have been wound round by sufficient cloth to contain one hundred pounds' weight of spice or ointment, so that the wrappings must have been considerably longer than the 14 feet $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches of this shroud. The best account in English of Christ's grave clothes is that of the late Master of Trinity Hall, the Rev. Henry Latham, who in 1917 published a book entitled *The Risen Master* (Deighton Bell, Cambridge). Readers will learn much if they turn to Chapter II. of that book. They will learn nothing from this.

A. J. MACDONALD.

AN INTRODUCTION TO PNEUMATOLOGY. By James Clark McKerrow, M.B. Longmans, Green and Co. 6s.

This book deserves a longer notice than can be given here. As one of many new books pressing the autonomy of religion it stands out as the work of a scientific man, fully acquainted with physiology and psychology. The thesis is that religion in man is as much an "emergence" from the lower grade as nationality, and that man is only subhuman until he attains a spiritual sense of his relation to God. The writer makes great play with the present bankruptcy of scientific certainty; science and religion alike are hypothetical; "the age of reason is past"; religion bears a similar relation to "animal reason," as the science of mind does to behaviourism.

A long chapter is devoted to the Pathology of Religion, in which the possible and actual divergencies from the writer's conception of the normal type of the proper integration of "creed, cult, and morality" (the ingredients of the expression of the religious spirit) are exhibited in divisions and subdivisions.

In the last three chapters the writer analyzes religious experience into the three distinct but inseparable elements of "revelation, contrition, and intention." He does this on the basis of the recognized psychological analysis of conscious experience into cognition, affection, and conation. The correlation if a trifle forced is remarkably interesting.

The writer's road is necessarily an obscure one; but it is illuminated and enlightened by constant arresting turns of thought and sayings which in their epigrammatic pithiness often sum up adequately an involved argument.

W. J. FERRAR.

ON FAMILIAR INTERCOURSE WITH GOD IN PRAYER. By the Ven. Louis de Ponte, S.J. Translated by a Religious of the Order of St. Benedict. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. Archbishop Alban Goodier, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 6s.

Louis de Ponte, or de la Puente, was a Spanish Jesuit, a contemporary of Ignatius Loyola, and his "Meditations" are well known. This is the first English translation of Treatise I. (there are four) of his "Spiritual Guide." In his introduction Archbishop Goodier points out that he "represents as probably does no other author the idea of the spirituality of his time." Thus for literary and historic reasons this translation is to be welcomed. But the translator and Archbishop Goodier regard the spiritual and edifying aspect as the most important, and that must seem rather doubtful.

De Ponte describes and commends elaborate and laborious methods of devotion, very typical of the seventeenth century, and still fostered by the Jesuits. To anyone not brought up to these methods or not temperamentally fitted for them, they appear wearisome and even terrifying, and utterly remote from the simplicity of true prayer. One feels that by the time the enormous quantity of divisions and rules has been mastered, there will be neither time nor strength left for real intercourse with God. The orthodoxy is unimpeachable, but the effect is devastating. Chapter XIV. on petition is thus subdivided: (1) Of petition of desire only; (2) of petitions by way of insinuation; (3) of those petitions which are made by bringing forward claims and reasons by which we may be heard; (4) titles and claims to be adduced on the side of God; (5) titles and causes on the side of Christ our

Lord; (6) claims through the merits of the saints. The most obvious and trivial points are described and illustrated at inordinate length, and the semi-mediæval methods of scriptural exegesis are more than usually tiresome. The translation is passable.

V. I. Ruffer.

The Great Migration. By J. Fitzgerald Lee. Skeffington. 15s.

There are many striking resemblances between the cultures of Egypt and Central America which will continue to attract the attention of scholars. Mr. Lee, following earlier authorities such as Major Noah, proves to his satisfaction that the exodus is a late and confused version of an original story which described the migration of the Hebrews from Mexico to Palestine. The Red Sea was originally the Behring Straits, which they crossed with dry feet, on the ice; the pillar of fire was the Northern Lights. Sinai is Sinim—*i.e.*, China. Argob (Deut. iii. 4) is the Gobi desert. There are many corroborations. Descent is traced from Adam, the "Red Man"; and Israel claimed Edom, the "Red Man," as his twin brother. Red Indians are rarely lame or squint—so also "there was not one feeble person among their tribes."

The method is that of Fluellen—"There is a river in Macedon, and there is also a river at Monmouth." The Foreword is by Canon Partridge, who says that the book is "worthy of the serious attention of Semitic scholars."

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Cornwall: The Land of the Gods. By T. F. G. Dexter, Ph.D. Jordan's Bookshop, Truro. 1s. 6d.

Dr. Dexter is working a rich mine, that is yielding golden returns in his study of Cornish place-names and Church dedications. He carries us back beyond uncertain hagiology to the days of sun and moon worship, horse worship, and the veneration of the apple-tree, the traces of which can still be seen in names and fast vanishing local customs. Such work needs none of the apologies that he offers, and we shall await with eagerness the promised exposition of his discoveries in a more worthy form than that of the small volume before us.

W. J. Ferrar.

Die Religionsgeschichte und das Urchristentum. By G. Kittel. C. Bertelsmann: Gütersloh. M. 6.

These Upsala Lectures are concerned with the profitable task of distinguishing the uniqueness of primitive Christianity. The first describes syncretism, in the freshest possible way, by printing many religious pictures of the period. The most striking is a wall picture discovered at Dura on the Euphrates in 1921, where a Palmyrene god might have been copied from an exceedingly modern and sentimental picture of the child Jesus with a halo. The second lecture treats Judaism in masterly fashion. While the Jews for the most part kept clear of syncretism, they succumbed to magic and astrology; synagogues recently discovered are decorated with the signs of the Zodiac.

The uniqueness of Christianity is shown above all in its power of

minting phrases with new meaning. *Doxa* in Greek is merely "opinion," in the New Testament it is "glory," eternal and unchangeable, something completely opposite. *Kosmos* is something different from "heaven and earth" of the Old Testament, or "the universe" of the Greeks; it is the ordered whole of this world. Most striking is a beautiful demonstration that *Abba*, "Father," had driven out *Abi*, "my Father," in Jewish usage, whereas "my brother," etc., remained—except in religious usage, where "my Father" survived. But Jesus uses the unique *Abba*, which to a Jew would sound like "Papa."

This is a charming and helpful book.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Development of Religious Toleration in England from the Beginning of the English Reformation to the Death of Queen Elizabeth. By W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. George Allen and Unwin. 21s.

Every historian knows that there are certain topics in his province on which the last word can never be said, and that the history of toleration is one of them. Otherwise Dr. Jordan might very reasonably claim to have said it, at least as regards the period covered by his investigations. His primary concern is, naturally, with the application of the Elizabethan Settlement. Nor does he mask his colours. "The Government steadfastly maintained that it did not propose to persecute conscience, and that it dictated modes of worship entirely for political ends. If these tenets were advanced for political purposes at the beginning of the reign, they had, by the conclusion of the reign, achieved substantial reality" (p. 82). It was "Machiavel's considerations and Aristotle's politics," rather than godly, single-minded zeal (as Henry Barrowe noted with some bitterness), that shaped official policy. We must allow that Dr. Jordan wins his case, however much we may be mortified at his conclusion that "toleration must be regarded as the result of social development and it rests entirely on the basis of empiricism. Essentially we are tolerant because no harm results from our being so." At long last, "the bases of national life were discovered to lie far deeper than religious uniformity," but "only when it becomes apparent that national and institutional life could continue in spite of dissenting views of religion was toleration at hand" (p. 169).

Undoubtedly this is one of the major contributions to historical scholarship of recent years. It does not break much new ground, apart from the important section on Acontius, but it covers the whole field with a thoroughness hitherto unexampled, and students of the period will find it indispensable. The development of Governmental and Anglican policy, the attitude of Protestant and Papistical Dissenters, the influence of Continental thinkers, are treated fully and judiciously and with great learning, the weight of which is the less burdensome from being so evenly distributed.

C. H. Smyth.

Saint Aelred of Rievaulx. By T. Edmund Harvey. Allenson. 3s. 6d.

Old ruins are the fashion. A charabanc comes along the road. Somebody shouts, "What's that funny old place?" and everybody wants to have a look. The charabanc pulls up; out jump the pleasure-seekers.

It may be a lady-abbess or a custodian who shows them round, and they stare with equal unconcern in the face of either, gaze uncomprehendingly at broken arch and crumbling wall, shout a joke or two, climb back into the charabanc and drive off to the next funny old ruin. The abbess or the guide may be glad if there are no cigarette cards and banana skins to clear up when the visitors have gone.

But perhaps one day a pilgrim approaches alone and on foot. He has maybe a question or two to ask, but otherwise little to say. He stands quietly, with reverent looks, as if to understand the spirit of the place, and to commune with those whose lives and prayers have sanctified it. The stones, even in their decay, can still speak. The prayers, however long ago they were uttered, seem to be immortal. The ruined abbey inspires something more than a poetic melancholy—the certainty of a deathless hope.

Perhaps in such a way this book came to be written. It is a short book, but it is beautiful. Aelred was a lovable saint. For the sake of a holy life, he deliberately turned his back on a brilliant career at the Scottish court, and in time became Abbot of the newly-founded Cistercian Abbey of Rievaulx. The life of an Abbot in the eleventh century was by no means an unexciting one. Fires, wars, the difficulties of building the abbey and of preparing the estate in a wild and unfriendly land, the ruling of undisciplined monks, tested the character of the Abbot to the uttermost, but he never seems to have been at a loss. In the midst of all his preoccupations, moreover, he found time to instruct the brethren in spiritual matters and to write many books for their edification. His teaching on Love as the fulfilling of the Law and on the supremacy of the Will, are in accordance with the finest mystical tradition. Under the rule of Aelred, the monastery became famous far and wide, "and thus there flocked to Rievaulx from foreign nations and from far-off confines of the earth monks who needed brotherly pity and true compassion, and they found peace there and the holiness without which none shall see God."

Aelred had none of the ascetic temper which makes a man believe that God is displeased by human affections. He loved his friends greatly and had no scruples in so doing. Indeed, many pages of his writings are devoted to the praise of friendship.

"There is not a stronger, more efficacious or more excellent medicine for our wounds at all times," he writes, "than to have one who meets every disadvantage of ours with sympathetic sorrow and everything that advantages us with sympathetic joy, bearing one another's burdens in accordance with the Apostle's words, each in turn with shoulders set together, saving only that each bears more lightly injury done to himself than injury done to his friend. Friendship then makes prosperity brighter and adversity lighter by dividing it and sharing it. And so a friend is the best medicine of life."

Turning the pages of this book, which is the work of a scholar and of a man gifted with historical imagination, we can understand why buildings such as Rievaulx, Glastonbury and many another were so beautiful. The monks built beautifully because they lived beautifully.

What will our descendants write of us, when they investigate the ruins of our cinemas and stadiums, and turn the light of their historical imagination on us?

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

INDIEN UND DAS CHRISTENTUM. II. Teil. Das Ringen des Christentums um das indische Volk. (The Struggle of Christianity for the Indian Nation.) Halle: Waisenhaus. M. 12.

The first volume of this series has already appeared under the title *Indische Frömmigkeit* (Indian Piety), and a third part is in preparation dealing with the infiltration of Indian ideas into Christian thought. Dr. Schomerus was for some years before the war a missionary of the Leipziger Missionsgesellschaft in South India, and is now professor in the university of Halle a. d. Saale. In this capacity he has published several valuable monographs on matters Indian and the substance of these he proposes to give in the trilogy referred to. Part I. gave a learned exposition of Hinduism in its nature and history, which brings out suggestively the character of its great schools of thought, dwelling specially on the *Bhaktimārag* or Way of Devotion as the most theistic of Hindu systems, yet never free in principle from the essential basis of Hinduism, which Prof. Schomerus calls *Theopanism* rather than *pantheism*, because its starting-point is not the idea that the universe in and around us is God, but rather the belief that God only is the reality of all things spiritual or material, good or bad, as we deem them. Contrasting this with the Fatherhood of God as revealed by Jesus Christ and its vital linking of morality with religion, Prof. Schomerus nevertheless emphasizes the educative value of Hinduism as a religion, despite its insatiable syncretism. He recognizes in caste a remarkable amalgamation of racial and social factors on a religious basis, which cannot be rightly treated without thoughtful understanding of its ideals.

On this background Prof. Schomerus in Part II. sketches the progress of Christianity in India and its present situation. The exposition is somewhat laboured, but the judgments of one who is both an evangelist and a scholar are worthy of our serious attention. The action and reaction of Christianity and nationalism are thoughtfully analyzed; on the whole, he thinks each has tended to purify the other because the missionary work of the last century acted as a denationalizing agency owing to its lack of sympathy in dealing with caste. But we may ask what was it, in the first instance, that led the missionary and the Indian Church generally to regard caste as a deadly foe. Simply that it reckoned all outside its nexus as *mlechh*, untouchable socially and religiously, and because caste relentlessly used the whole force of its social ban, and at times even prison and violence, to bar any profession of Christianity that infringed its rules; for, as Prof. Schomerus remarks, the gentle Hindu is quite capable of being fiercely intolerant. And when we come to considerate treatment of caste within the Christian Church it does not encourage us to find Indian Christians who refuse Holy Communion at the hands of a pastor of lower caste. As a touchstone of religion (its essential claim) caste is ethically incompatible with the gospel. As a factor in national life it is most strongly condemned by the keenest nationalists. By its uplift of the casteless classes Christianity has done more to lay a sound foundation for national life than any other agency.

Prof. Schomerus severely criticizes the influence of British rule as undervaluing and debilitating Indian culture and thought, but he has little to say of the administration which alone made possible the work of his own and other missions and the education which trained the mind of India for the resurgence of nationalism, as well as for the reception of Christian ideals. In the spread of these among the upper classes he sees

one of the chief results, as well as the hopeful features of future missionary work. He stresses the need of guarding against syncretism while aiming to develop distinctively Indian thought in theology and feeling in worship. He thinks that the Lutheran type of Christianity is particularly suited to bring this about by reason of its "Innerlichkeit" (religious depth).

The horizon of the book is that of South India, which partly accounts for the omission of Islam as an element in Indian life and thought and evangelism. But it is strange that very little should be said of the work of literature and of the development of rural Christian life. In view of the thousands now coming in from the Sudras as a direct result of work among the untouchables it is strange to find Dr. Schomerus writing: "As things are in India, we can hardly expect that members of a lower caste will decisively influence those of a higher." God has chosen the things that are not that He might bring to nought those that are. None the less, the book is well worth careful study, and we look forward to the third volume.

H. U. WEITBRECHT STANTON.

BOOK NOTES

The Call of Christ. By R. J. Campbell, D.D. 5s.

No Traveller Returns. By Clarence May. 3s. 6d.

Seasonable Sermons. By Alfred Thomas. 6s.
(All published by Skeffington.)

The Christian Character. By R. E. Roberts. Allenson. 3s. 6d.
Excellent examples of the sermons which are being delivered today by representative preachers.

Report of the Second Anglo-Catholic Priests' Convention: Public Worship. C.L.A. 7s. 6d. These Reports suffer rather from the law of diminishing returns, but there is much admirable material in this, worth putting on the shelf for future reference.

Walls of Jericho. By J. Cecil Maby. Heath Cranton, Ltd. 7s. 6d. Essays on Progress, Faith, The Kinema, A Bastard Philosophy, and Idols Old and New, by a writer who has read widely and thought earnestly. His theological outlook may be seen, though not understood, in a statement contrasting a few "sincere modernists," namely Dean Inge, Mr. Sheppard, and Fr. Ronald Knox, with the Bishops of Exeter and Birmingham in their "shaky old brougham of late-Victorian orthodoxy" (p. 155).

W. K. L. C.

Famous Hymns: Their Writers and Tunes. By J. Lionel Bennett. Skeffington. 7s. 6d. Mr. Bennett knows a great deal about hymns and tunes, and his selection ranges from "Hail, Gladdening Light" to "O Valiant Hearts." But he seems to have no particular principle of arrangement, and the book is loaded with irrelevant matter from his views on monasticism to *The Jungle Book.*

Everyman's Story of the Oxford Movement. By T. Dilworth-Harrison. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. A very energetic and readable outline. The author

works in strong black and white and revels in persecution. But did "the enormous increase in our sense of missionary responsibility" really emanate entirely from Oxford as well as all the rest of the religious awakening of the century?

Temptation in the Twentieth Century. By W. H. Elliott. Mowbray. 2s. As Canon Elliott says, temptation in the twentieth century is not so very different from what it was in others. But in these B.B.C. addresses he tells twentieth-century people wisely and simply how temptations arise and what to do with them.

Creation and Redemption. By W. H. Cock, B.Sc. Skeffington. 7s. 6d. A book which purports to be "the only textbook necessary for the teacher, preacher and general reader" on what the Bible and Science teach on Creation and Redemption, all in under 300 pages, cannot stop to argue. The origins of religion and sacrifice are settled in two pages; the teaching of Zechariah, we are told, is "distinguished by sanctified common sense." Isaiah and the institution of Holy Communion are passed over, and the son of Zebedee "possibly wrote the Gospel, the First, Second, and Third Epistles of John, and the book of Revelation."

The Way to God. Edited by Sir James Marchant. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 12s. 6d. This is a beautiful selection of extracts from "Masters of the Spiritual Life," telling how the way to God may be found, the way of Prayer, Perfection, the Religious Life, the Love of God, etc. The usual scrappiness of an anthology is largely avoided, as most of the extracts are long enough to be read as separate essays. Apparently the Church of England has had few masters of the spiritual life since the Reformation.

M. D. R. W.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER